

**HARVARD COLLEGE
LIBRARY**



**GIFT OF THE
GOVERNMENT
OF THE UNITED STATES**

INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE
LOS ANGELES, CALIF., AREA—Part 4

HEARINGS
BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

JULY 1 AND 2, 1955

Printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities

INCLUDING INDEX



HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

OCT 31 1955

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1955

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania, *Chairman*

MORGAN M. MOULDER, Missouri

HAROLD H. VELDE, Illinois

CLYDE DOYLE, California

BERNARD W. KEARNEY, New York

JAMES B. FRAZIER, Jr., Tennessee

DONALD L. JACKSON, California

EDWIN E. WILLIS, Louisiana

GORDON H. SCHERER, Ohio

THOMAS W. BEALE, Sr., *Chief Clerk*

CONTENTS

PART 1

	Page
June 27, 1955: Testimony of—	
Paul Wright Orr.....	1440
Afternoon session:	
Andries Deinum.....	1474
Anita Bell Schneider.....	1498
June 28, 1955: Testimony of—	
Angela Clarke.....	1523
Cecil Beard.....	1538
Diamond Kim.....	1543
Afternoon session:	
Diamond Kim (resumed).....	1565
Sue Lawson.....	1572
George Hugh Murray Maitland Hardyman.....	1575

PART 2

June 29, 1955: Testimony of—	
George Hugh Murray Maitland Hardyman (resumed).....	1599
Raphael Konigsberg.....	1656
Afternoon session:	
Sylvia Schonfield.....	1668
Jean Wilkinson.....	1676
Frank C. Davis.....	1679
Irene B. Bowerman.....	1689
Carl Sugar.....	1697

PART 3

June 30, 1955: Testimony of—	
Matthew Samuel Vidaver, Jr.....	1707
William Elconin.....	1713
William Ward Kimple.....	1731
Afternoon session:	
William Ward Kimple (resumed).....	1742
Max Benjamin Natapoff.....	1761
Tashia Freed.....	1764
Max Appleman.....	1768
Joseph W. Aidlin.....	1771

PART 4

July 1, 1955: Testimony of—	
Stephen A. Werek.....	1779
Afternoon session:	
Stephen A. Werek (resumed).....	1811
James Burford.....	1827
Anne Pollock.....	1837
Margaret Vaughn Meyer.....	1844
July 2, 1955: Testimony of—	
Stephen A. Werek (resumed).....	1851
John Waters Houston.....	1860
Harry Hay.....	1872
Martha Hard Wheeldin.....	1875
Louis Stark.....	1882
Robert L. Brock.....	1889

Index.....	I
------------	---

PUBLIC LAW 601, 79TH CONGRESS

The legislation under which the House Committee on Un-American Activities operates is Public Law 601, 79th Congress [1946], chapter 753, 2d session, which provides:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, * * **

PART 2—RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

RULE X

SEC. 121. STANDING COMMITTEES

* * * * *

17. Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

* * * * *

(q) (1) Committee on Un-American Activities.

(A) Un-American Activities.

(2) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole, or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (i) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (ii) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (iii) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

RULES ADOPTED BY THE 84TH CONGRESS

House Resolution 5, January 5, 1955

* * * * *

RULE X

STANDING COMMITTEES

1. There shall be elected by the House, at the commencement of each Congress, the following standing committees:

* * * * *

(q) Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

* * * * *

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

* * * * *

17. Committee on Un-American Activities.

(a) Un-American Activities.

(b) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time, investigations of (1) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE LOS ANGELES, CALIF., AREA—Part 4

FRIDAY, JULY 1, 1955

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Los Angeles, Calif.

PUBLIC HEARING

A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met at 9:40 a. m., pursuant to recess, in room 518, Federal Building, Los Angeles, Calif., Hon. Clyde Doyle (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Clyde Doyle (chairman); Morgan M. Moulder, Donald L. Jackson, and Gordon H. Scherer.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, counsel; and William A. Wheeler, investigator.

Mr. DOYLE. The committee will please convene.

Mr. WEREB, will you please rise and be sworn. Do you solemnly swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. WEREB. I do.

TESTIMONY OF STEPHEN A. WEREB

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state your name, please sir.

Mr. WEREB. Stephen A. Werek.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted that you are not accompanied by counsel. You are familiar with the rule of the committee, are you not, that you are entitled to counsel if you so desire?

Mr. WEREB. I am, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell your name, please.

Mr. WEREB. W-e-r-e-b.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Werek?

Mr. WEREB. I was born at Alpha, N. J., April 27, 1898.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you presently reside in Los Angeles County?

Mr. WEREB. I do, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you resided in Los Angeles County?

Mr. WEREB. Thirty-five years, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your formal educational training has been?

Mr. WEREB. I have had grade-school education, high-school education, and I have had 1 year of business and business administration at the University of Pennsylvania.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation?

Mr. WEREB. At the present time I own and operate the Weber Type-writer Service.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you had occasion in the past to be employed by any investigative branch of the Federal Government?

Mr. WEREB. I have, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the nature of that employment?

Mr. WEREB. I worked for the Federal Bureau of Investigation as an undercover agent.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, how it happened that you were employed in that capacity?

Mr. WEREB. My attention first to subversive talks, literature, activities, was drawn by leaflets, speeches, and aggressiveness and the pro-Russian attitude of certain people along my stops, and this alarmed me to such an extent that I took the necessary steps to inquire further, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What do you mean by saying "along your stops"?

Mr. WEREB. During my work at the Typewriter Service, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to your being employed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, had you been affiliated in any manner with the Communist Party?

Mr. WEREB. I had not, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you testified prior to today on the subject of communism?

Mr. WEREB. I have, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. In what courts or before what bodies did you testify?

Mr. WEREB. I have testified at the Smith Act trials of *Schneiderman v. the United States Government* in 1953, I believe, and then I appeared before this committee in San Diego last year.

Mr. TAVENNER. That was for a limited purpose at San Diego, I believe.

Mr. WEREB. That is right, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. You did not at that time testify generally about your knowledge of Communist Party activities in the Los Angeles County area?

Mr. WEREB. I did not.

Mr. TAVENNER. As a result of being employed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, did you seek admission to the Communist Party?

Mr. WEREB. I did, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a photostatic copy of what appears to be a Communist Party card. Will you identify it, please?

(Document handed to the witness.)

Mr. WEREB. This was my membership book in the Hawthorne group of the Communist Party in 1944.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was it issued to you by the Communist Party?

Mr. WEREB. It was issued to me by the membership director at that time, one Vernon L. Potter, at my home, who identified himself as the membership chairman of that group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you examine the card and state whether or not it shows the name of the person who was the owner of the book?

Mr. WEREB. It does.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is the name?

Mr. WEREB. S. A. Weber.

Mr. TAVENNER. S. A. Weber?

Mr. WEREB. That is right, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Your name is Wereb?

Mr. WEREB. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that your party name?

Mr. WEREB. It was used during my membership in the party, but this name has been published in the Daily News—not the Daily News, but the Legal Daily, for the purpose of doing business under the name of Weber Typewriter Service and it was at the behest and suggestion of some of my accounts. Therefore, I took legal steps to change it to that only doing business.

Mr. TAVENNER. But that is the name in the Communist Party by which you registered?

Mr. WEREB. That is correct; they never knew my real name.

Mr. TAVENNER. During what period of time did you work within the Communist Party for the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

Mr. WEREB. Approximately from October of 1943 until the 1st of January or thereabouts of 1948.

Mr. TAVENNER. What prompted you to undertake an assignment of that character?

Mr. WEREB. Well, sir, my people came from Europe—they came from a place of oppression—and I was born here and I just could not quite understand the stories that I heard from immigrants and other people who have taken refuge here, what a wonderful place this is, and how anyone could attempt to use force or violence to try to overthrow or even subversion to overthrow this type of government, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. That motivated you in undertaking this difficult assignment?

Mr. WEREB. That is correct, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. During the course of these years which you gave to work within the Communist Party, did you find it to be a difficult assignment and one which influenced your life during that period of time?

Mr. WEREB. The only influence I have ever had with my association—that is, through the association of the Communist Party—was a greater love that I have for the country, because of their teaching, of their unacceptable philosophy, of their impossible attitude, and the continuous mistrust of one another—the revolutionary tendencies. In other words, if I did have, shall we say, such a thought as a progressive thought ever in my bones, which I don't believe I ever had, that certainly would have cured me.

Mr. TAVENNER. In what sense do you use the term "progressive"?

Mr. WEREB. I mean that as the Communist Party uses it. There are times that it is more applicable to use that you are a progressive rather than a Communist, wherever the case may fit. For instance, if you are an active person in the union, they do not exactly relish the idea of you standing out there as a Communist but they would rather have you there as a "progressive" person; or if you are active in any politics of any kind, they try and avert the Communist approach from anything, but what they try to do is use the words "progressive," "democratic," "democracy." They drag that around just like a dirty rug.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there anything of significance that occurred within a few months prior to the time you actually became a member of the Communist Party in carrying out your assignment which would be of value to the committee?

Mr. WEREB. Just the sort of an explanation of how hard it is to get into this group. In other words, I tried wholeheartedly, I attended every function advertised in the Peoples Daily World and everywhere where I might have met some of these "progressive" people, I have attended every function and it took me—

Mr. TAVENNER. In using the term "progressive," are you using it in quotation marks?

Mr. WEREB. In quotation marks—still the same men, still the same answer as in the previous answer, sir. I tried my very best, visited book stores at that time known as the progressive book shop, and there Marxist literature of all types was to be had: guides as to how to be a good Communist: Lenin's works, Stalin's works, and I managed to read up on those the best I could until I was finally approached to join the party at one of the functions, but it was a 3-month chore.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, who it was that approached you to interest you in becoming a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. WEREB. In the month of January in 1944 a Wilhelmina Maise, whom I knew for a long time as a functionary and as one of the full-time workers at the Peoples Daily World, approached me and signed me up for the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is the proper spelling of the name M-a-i-s-e?

Mr. WEREB. That is as far as I can remember, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you proceed to describe what occurred.

Mr. WEREB. At this party there were approximately two to three hundred people present. It was held at 2200 West Seventh Street and it was held by the West Lake group, at that time known as the West Lake Club of the Communist Party. They had a lot of drinking, they had an affair called their social. It was a celebration of an officers' installation. At that time Willamena Maise was also installed as the chairman of the West Lake group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was it that actually gave you your Communist Party card, the photostatic copy of which I exhibited to you?

Mr. WEREB. A person known to me by the name of Vernon L. Potter came to my home and I identified myself and he identified himself as the membership chairman of the Hawthorne Communist group, and he gave me my membership card and also my first assignment.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was that assignment?

Mr. WEREB. My first assignment was, sir, to attend a function known also as an installation affair at the home of one John and Georgiana Garrish. I think the address—I am not sure of the number, but it was on Paseo de Gracia in Redondo.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is the spelling?

Mr. WEREB. G-a-r-r-i-s-h.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is the party's name?

Mr. WEREB. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was any security measure taken to ascertain your future reliability by the Communist Party at the time you entered the Communist Party, or was any such security measure taken at a later date?

Mr. WEREB. Security measures of that type were taken at a later date. I was closely watched and sent to workers' school the first time before I was integrated into the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state again briefly what this first assignment was?

Mr. WEREB. This first assignment was for me to attend this inauguration affair on Paseo de Gracia at the home of Garrish, and there the new elected or—well, I would not say elected, but dictated officers of the club were introduced. I imagine there were 40 or 45 people there. At that time I did not know too many, but I did identify Vernon Potter, John Houston, the Garrish family, and Juanita Smith. I do not recall at the present time any more names that I would remember because that was my first affair.

At this party, of course after the introductions finally, a man by the name of John Houston was introduced, brought out from one of the side rooms, and he came in and they introduced him as the chairman, the new chairman of the Hawthorne-Inglewood Communist group.

Mr. TAVENNER. This was a meeting of the Hawthorne group of the Communist Party?

Mr. WEREB. That is right, sir. There was no official meeting known as—like the other meetings that consist of Marxist class or an educational period. There was no educational period but there were some guessing games played such as what Lenin did and who Engels was, and then they gave prizes, maybe, of a sandwich or so or gave you a little extra pamphlet if you had the right answers. I had no answers because I did not know anything about them. Then there was this man Houston. When he was introduced to the crowd of 50 people or 40 people, he expressed his feeling of gratitude to the crowd and stated at that time that if we had been reading the papers, Russia at that time was divided into 16 separate countries and if we worked hard enough in the United States of America, we—that is, the Communists—we could make this country the 17th state or country of the Soviet Union.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall his first name, Houston's first name?

Mr. WEREB. John.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you become well acquainted with Mr. Houston in your future connection with the Hawthorne Group of the Communist Party?

Mr. WEREB. We became personal acquaintances, sir. I met him on the average of, oh, I would say, 3 times a month or sometimes 5 times a month. It would all depend on the assignments and the meetings that we held.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask a question here, please.

You mean that right here in Hawthorne and Los Angeles County, Hawthorne being, as I remember it—maybe it is part of the city limits of Los Angeles now; I don't know. But I know it is right next door to the city limits of Los Angeles on the south. You mean right there in our midst this man was preaching and advocating that your Communist cell work hard toward the objective of making the United States of America the 17th state of the Soviet Union?

Mr. WEREB. That is correct, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. It is not a laughing matter, I am sure, for folks who may be in the room; nothing funny about it.

Mr. SCHIERER. Were we going to get a star?

Mr. WEREB. I do not know, sir. No star was mentioned.

Mr. DOYLE. How many would be at a meeting like that?

Mr. WEREB. At that meeting I believe there were 40 or 50 people, but outside of the names I have already called, I could not identify more

because I did not know any more. That was my first function and first assignment.

Mr. DOYLE. Do you know at what level of authority in the Communist Party Houston came from?

Mr. WEREB. He was a chairman, and to become a chairman of any Communist group you must have the approval of the county officers and the county officers usually know and approve all candidates. For instance, at one time I was elected a membership director but the county kind of did not think that was the proper thing to do, so they unelected me very quickly within 2 months. In other words, I was not given any records at that time of any members or membership. I was not given any authority like the other membership directors had, and there was nothing done at club level that was not dictated by the county Communist Party.

Mr. DOYLE. How did you know they unelected you? Did they tell you so?

Mr. WEREB. Well, yes, sir; I believe I was told that Edith Smith, who has been the membership director up until that time, would be the proper person for that job. I was not directly told, but I was not trusted; but I could read between the lines that—well, they were not sure.

Mr. DOYLE. How old a man would you estimate this fellow Houston to be that was speaking apparently with the authority of the Communist County Committee in Los Angeles County when he said the objective was to work to have the United States of America the 17th state of the Soviet Union? How old a man would he be?

Mr. WEREB. I would say at that time approximately 36 to 38 years old.

Mr. DOYLE. He was not a child, then, and he was not in his dotage?

Mr. WEREB. No, sir. He was a well-educated man.

Mr. DOYLE. In this meeting room at Inglewood, the Communist Club or cell where it met, what decorations did they have so far as pictures, if any, of people or—of course, they had the flag of the United States up, did they not?

Mr. WEREB. No, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. They did not?

Mr. WEREB. No, sir. This was at a home of Mr. and Mrs. Garrish.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you ever see a flag of the United States at any Communist cell meeting?

Mr. WEREB. I believe at one time at the Embassy Auditorium they had one underneath the balcony in a little hidden corner, but it was a flag that was small and there were so many large Communist posters up that you certainly would have to be a trickster to see the American flag.

Mr. DOYLE. What kind of posters were up?

Mr. WEREB. Money drives for membership and money drives for defense, money drives for fighting different Congressmen.

Mr. DOYLE. Did they have any pictures of Stalin or any of the rest of the Communist leaders? The reason I ask you that question is that in many of our hearings we have evidence under oath by former bona fide Communists the fact that they never display an American flag in their club meetings or cells but they almost always have a picture in their established club rooms, if they are such, of Stalin and Engels

and these other Communists leaders but never any of distinguished Americans.

Mr. WEREB. I have never seen Stalin's picture, with the exception at the Embassy Auditorium and at the Shrine Auditorium at one time. The rest of the times our group always met at different homes and under different circumstances. We tried never to meet twice in the same place.

Mr. SCHIERER. When you say you saw a picture at the Shrine Auditorium, is that when the Communists had rented the auditorium and were conducting the meeting?

Mr. WEREB. That is right, sir. I am sorry if you misunderstood.

Mr. SCHIERER. I did not misunderstand, I wanted the record clear.

Mr. WEREB. Thank you.

Mr. DOYLE. If they had Stalin's picture on those occasions, they must have had the picture of some President of the United States right alongside, did they not?

Mr. WEREB. They may have, but at the present time I do not recall.

Mr. DOYLE. You would be apt to recall it, would you not?

Mr. WEREB. I do not think I looked for the President's picture to be there, but if I did, I would have ignored the President's picture regardless of the circumstances because I have always considered the President of the United States to be a wonderful person, no matter who he was, and thought his picture might have been misused. At one time I think Mr. Truman's picture was up, but I do not recall where.

Mr. DOYLE. I do not think we have had any testimony in any place in the country that any picture of any great American was displayed in any Communist cell meeting. That is the reason for my question, even though the pictures of Soviet great men were prominently displayed.

Thank you, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did Mr. John Houston give you any Communist Party assignments?

Mr. WEREB. The very first assignment Mr. Houston gave me was to attend a workers school. This school I did attend, and it was conducted in a building on Third Street between Spring and Broadway. At the present time I do not know the name of this building, but it was on the second floor. There were no markings on the doors, but I did see a number of people in the evening going into these places. So I followed one of the bunches—that is, one of the groups—and I went into this class. There were 10 weeks of this Marxist class.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who were the instructors?

Mr. WEREB. The first class I attended, sir, was taught by a man named Max Silver and he taught the advanced Marxist sciences, as they called it, or Communist program, and—well, they asked me a question and I felt kind of stupid because I did not know what they were talking about. They asked me how long had I been a Communist, and I told them I had just joined and been assigned to this school. He said, "Did you ever learn Marxism or communism?" and I said, "No." He said, "You go across the hall and there is another teacher, Emily Gordon, and she will teach all the beginners." Then I attended the rest of the nine sessions under the tutelage of Miss Gordon.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have any further Communist Party instruction or schooling?

Mr. WEREB. I have had about 35 different classes that I attended during my membership in the Communist Party, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you describe them in just a general way?

Mr. WEREB. The Peoples Educational Center.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend that at the instruction of the Communist Party?

Mr. WEREB. I did, sir. I was told to go there by Emily Gordon and——

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that school being operated by the Communist Party?

Mr. WEREB. Well, the only way I could explain that to you, sir, to be frank, is that they did not want to be known as Communists, but the Communist Party gave them all their papers, all their typewriters, all the equipment, all the money, and the teachers. That I know to be true, sir, because I helped transfer some of the typewriters and some of the instructive literature which were of Communist nature into this school. I believe there were two teachers there. One was known as William Wolf. They introduced him as a member of the party from New York. Then there was one John Howard Lawson who was the other instructor that I met and I knew there.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say you attended 35 classes. Do you mean by that a different teaching group?

Mr. WEREB. That is right, sir. You see, the policy of the party is—that is, it was at that time—that Marxism and Leninism and bolshevism would be the prime and the only objective. Therefore, there would be refresher courses that would average 4 to 5 a year and they would be, say, classes of 4, classes of 5—that is, a series of 4 or 5 is what I meant—and they, especially the leadership, would be instructed to attend these meetings. These meetings ordinarily were held by full-time county functionaries, such as the educational directors or working from the educational director of the Communist Party of Los Angeles County, sometimes the State; and then there were functionaries' schools, preparatory schools. To become a functionary, I have attended some of those, sir. They are too numerous to mention.

Mr. DOYLE. What year was that?

Mr. WEREB. This is all between the year of 1944, January, and 1948. That is, the first of January 1948.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there any substantial difference in the type of instruction that was received from January 1944 up until 1948?

Mr. WEREB. Yes. The classes that were conducted directly by the party were of more revolutionary nature than conducted by the Peoples Educational Center. This Peoples Educational Center class was sort of an introductory class to some who might be a prey or easy prey to communism.

Eva Shafran—she is deceased at this time—she was a Russian citizen and here direct from Russia to teach this. Eva Shafran held some open classes to labor leaders and union members. I think this was at the second floor of the Embassy Auditorium, prior to my actually becoming a member, during the time I tried to gain membership.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you attend any of those classes?

Mr. WEREB. I did, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where were these classes generally held?

Mr. WEREB. Most of the classes for the club members were held in homes of people who had been Marxists for quite a while. There were a number of classes held at the home of Lou Stark. I do not recall his address. Then there were a number of classes held at the home of Edith Smith, Mike Gorman—a number of classes held at William Kellas' home.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me stop you there a moment. In mentioning the names of these persons in whose homes the meetings were held, I want to know whether you knew those people to be members of the Communist Party.

Mr. WEREB. I did, sir, because these were all closed Communist affairs and you could not enter unless you were identified or you had some identification from the county as a representative, you were the instructor.

Mr. TAVENNER. Up to this point you have mentioned the name of Mr. Louis Stark.

Mr. WEREB. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. WEREB. He was a member of the Communist Party because I issued him, I believe in the year 1946 I issued the membership cards, and I believe that it is a record of the Government that I did issue that card.

Mr. TAVENNER. The second person that you named in whose home these meetings were held, I do not recall. Do you recall who the second one was?

Mr. WEREB. Edith Smith or William Kellas.

Mr. TAVENNER. Both of those?

Mr. WEREB. Edith Smith was the membership director of our group throughout most of the time. We had what they called club internal strife. That is where your distrust of 1 member of another and the accusation of 1 member and another was continuous. We had continual turnover. Instead of a man serving in an office for a period of 1 year that he was supposedly elected to, he would probably serve 3 or 4 months and something would come along and they would change officers.

Then the home of this William Kellas, who was known to me as a chairman, I believe on two occasions of our Communist group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is the spelling K-e-l-l-a-s?

Mr. WEREB. Correct, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask one question here? A few moments ago you said that some of these classes were more revolutionary in their nature and instruction than others. Do you remember saying that?

Mr. WEREB. I did, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. In what way do you use the term "revolutionary"?

Mr. WEREB. May I call one class event to your attention, sir, with your permission? We had a teacher by the name of Elizabeth Leich—

Mr. DOYLE. How do you spell it?

Mr. WEREB. Elizabeth L-e-i-c-h G-l-e-n-n. This woman was sent to us by the county educational committee, Los Angeles County Communist Party Educational Committee. She was sent to teach us Marxism and Leninism, of course. During this class she spoke of the

progress of Marxism and Leninism and how well it is and tried to sell the idea of the capitalists not owning tools and labor, having just labor, but the people should own everything and how eventually it would wind into an impossible situation.

So one of the members of the class asked what she meant by that. She said, "Of course I mean that there would be a revolution," and she said this revolution would come about and there would be many people hurt, people get killed—including workers; there would be an overthrow of the Government, confiscation of private property. This woman, sir, was an official teacher of the Los Angeles County Communist Party.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you hear her say that?

Mr. WEREB. I did, sir. I sat there and heard her say so.

Mr. DOYLE. Where did that occur?

Mr. WEREB. That occurred at the home of Lou Stark.

Mr. DOYLE. About what year?

Mr. WEREB. I would say the year of 1945, latter part of 1945 or first of 1946.

Mr. DOYLE. Was that a closed Communist Party meeting?

Mr. WEREB. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. About how many people were there?

Mr. WEREB. I believe I have notes. Would you like to hear them, sir? I believe I have—

Mr. DOYLE. I do not mean to take over your examination.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think since you asked that question he should answer.

Mr. DOYLE. I was interested in that one particular thing, that particular revolutionary matter.

Mr. TAVENNER. He should be allowed to refresh his recollection.

Mr. WEREB. I have notes.

Mr. DOYLE. When did you make those notes?

Mr. WEREB. I made them regularly right after the meeting and at the present time after I severed my connection with the party I did manage to keep out a few little things for myself, and I do have some information which was not easy to get. I could give you this class and the people that were there. Yes; here it is, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Is there a date on those notes?

Mr. WEREB. No, sir, just general; no dates. Yes, it shows when his teaching was—I beg your pardon. It was 1947, not 1946. There were present at that time John Houston, Vernon Potter, Jack Karson, Edith Smith, Lou Stark and his wife Mrs. Marion Stark. Mike Gorman and Ed Fitzgerald, I believe. There was a Lillian Frong.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was that last name?

Mr. WEREB. Lillian Frong, F-r-o-n-g, and Sam Chriss.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is the spelling of Chriss?

Mr. WEREB. C-h-r-i-s-s. That is phonetic, as close as I ever came to the correct spelling. Marion Stark is the first name of Mrs. Stark. Pauline Sullivan, Ida Karson, Chester Fein.

Mr. TAVENNER. F-e-i-n?

Mr. WEREB. Correct, sir; Adrienne Fein. And a man known to me by the name of Mel Wilkerson at that meeting, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask one more question, Counsel.

At that particular class which you have mentioned when this woman was describing the revolutionary action that had to come or would

come in her judgment, what part, if any, was the Communist membership to play in the revolution? What were they to do?

Mr. WEREB. They were to be the prime and the ruling factor of this revolution, sir. They would guide it and that was one of the reasons they said the only way it could be done is having enough people in the labor unions who were Marxist trained and Marxist and Leninist education and had the Stalin spirit, and those people were the people who would help put about this program. That is at one of the classes. There were a number of classes of this nature, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say there were a number of classes of this nature?

Mr. WEREB. Yes, there were. I also recall another class that was held at the home of William Kellas. This man Kellas was known to me as a party member and by his own admission as far back as 1923 or 1924, at that time, was known by a different name.

Mr. Kellas was a very, very well read and well educated Marxist and all his time and all his effort went into the Marxist education and teaching. He taught a class. I would have to refer to my notes as to when this was again, but I will give you a general idea of what they called a cadre class. This cadre class, I will manage to explain, is a class who is taught leadership. He most naturally was questioned as to what this—well, we only have one leadership, but at the present time what is it?—and he said this cadre class is for a leadership of five depth.

Mr. DOYLE. What?

Mr. WEREB. Five depth. Five labor chairmen, five literature directors, five of everything. If the Federal Bureau of Investigation decided or the Government decided to have the Federal Bureau of Investigation arrest these people for subversive activities or trouble came along, the second group automatically would step right up. If the police or some other law-enforcement agency came along and arrested these people, the third would function and so on down the line until the five were exhausted, and by that time there would be a fruitful result of this turmoil that he was speaking of at that time.

Mr. SCHERER. They recognized, then, the possible illegality of their actions and their organization in setting up such an organization?

Mr. WEREB. They never doubted for one moment that they were an illegal and a revolutionary group, sir. If they thought for one moment that any member in that group did not have revolutionary ideas or was not progressing well enough in his Marxist teaching or his revolutionary tendencies, he did not stay very long. The party would manage to bounce him or kick him out.

Mr. DOYLE. As I understand it, right here in Los Angeles, in Hawthorne and other places, these Communist meetings and classes which you attended, this doctrine and philosophy which you have related was openly taught in secret meetings?

Mr. WEREB. That is right, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. What year was that?

Mr. WEREB. That was in August of 1946. I have that. I also have other classes to that effect, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. That was a year and a half or 2 years after Earl Browder was kicked out of the control of the American Communist Party because he believed that the two systems of economy could get

along side by side in the world. Didn't you ever hear anyone object to that sort of philosophy?

Mr. WEREB. That they should get along?

Mr. DOYLE. No, this revolutionary philosophy. Didn't any of the American citizens present there ever object to that sort of instruction?

Mr. WEREB. Mr. Doyle, with all apologies to this committee, I do not believe a Communist could be a citizen of this country because I do not believe that his allegiance would be strong enough to call himself a citizen, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. I agree with you, but then I am asking you now the question: Did you ever hear any American citizen object to this sort of teaching in any of these meetings?

Mr. WEREB. No, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Not even question them?

Mr. WEREB. No, sir; just as to procedure sometimes.

Mr. DOYLE. Was that the procedure whereby they were teaching that it would be necessary to arm sometimes, use arms and force?

Mr. WEREB. In order to use arms and force to shoot people, including workers, to have bloodshed you must have arms. The source of arms I never was told where it would come from, just how it would come about. I was never given that information, but I am sure there were others who did have that information. Do you want me to go on further with these classes, sir?

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me ask you a question at that point. You spoke of Elizabeth Glenn being one of the instructors sent down from a higher level of the Communist Party. You have told us of the nature of the instructions she gave you. Can you tell us anything further about the instruction that she gave your group?

Mr. WEREB. Elizabeth Leich Glenn taught a series of different classes. I mentioned to you the last, the most outstanding of all, and she of course taught Marxism, Leninism, the works of Stalin, wages and price, and actions of labor in strife. This is the type of education she taught. There were others that taught something different, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well. Proceed.

Mr. WEREB. We had another series of classes at the home of Dan McComb. M-c-C-o-m-b, I believe. I would have to see the spelling. This man I knew to be a good Marxist, a good Commie. He worked hard for the party, and he also served as chairman of the Hawthorne Communist group and at his home we had a series of classes that was taught by a person named Harry Hay. This man Hay also identified himself to the group as being sent to our club as a teacher of Marxism-Leninism by the county educational committee. He said that he was from the Eagle Rock district, and he also was an active Communist for a long time. This man spoke of the American system of elections whereby the American elections are just not right; they couldn't be—it is a Fascist-like election system and it could not serve the masses. He taught that the Communist Party had a plan. For example, he would say the maritime union. He said, "Now there is a good example for you."

Mr. SCHERER. What type of elections did he propose?

Mr. WEREB. The general elections of representatives like yourself, sir, Government elections.

Mr. SCHERER. What type of elections did he propose?

Mr. WEREB. I am coming to that, sir. He said that you take your maritime union, for example, as a group. Those people are not in port most of the time. They are absent. Therefore, some of the absentee ballots never get in. What the party proposed at that time was to have one man of the Communist Party vote as a block for the maritime union. They questioned him somewhat as to the possibility of that, and he said that many places in the Soviet Union or in countries where they have a Bolshevik government such practices are common. In other words, instead of having the workers always come in and vote, they have one man cast the ballot for them as a blanket ballot. That was one of the series of classes. I have more.

Mr. SCHIERER. Did they advocate any other system of voting?

Mr. WEREB. That system whereby one man votes for a group.

Mr. SCHIERER. Did they advocate the proportional representation system of voting?

Mr. WEREB. That was a Fascist idea.

Mr. SCHIERER. Proportional representation?

Mr. WEREB. In other words, if you took a man from a certain district because he represented that district, that was not any good; that was a reactionary idea. But as one man, they would manage to pick and appoint and elect. Is that what you had reference to?

Mr. SCHIERER. No, I do not think you quite understand what I mean by proportional representation system of voting, so I will just withdraw the question.

Mr. WEREB. All right.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask one question along a different line? I do not know what your answer may be because I have never discussed it with you. What did you see, if anything, in activity for or with children and young people, the teen-age in Los Angeles County? Did you come in touch with that phase of the activities of the Communist Party? If so, what did you learn?

Mr. WEREB. The only phase of that I know, sir, is that they had one man by the name of Mayer Frieden.

Mr. DOYLE. How do you spell his last name?

Mr. WEREB. F-r-i-e-d-e-n, I believe. The Mayer would be phonetic, M-e-y-e-r or M-a-y-e-r, I would not know. He had charge of the youth group at that time. Young Communist League, which became American Youth for Democracy. They tossed it around for some other name. I visited their office once or twice, but I do not recall that I—I was too busy with other assignments to get into the youth group, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Our hearings all over the country show they very actively endeavored to get activity among American youth and interest. In fact they established camps known as a pioneer group to counteract the influence of the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts.

Mr. WEREB. That is true, because they were asked—I remember that they impressed the classes, especially on members, to have their children—at that time their policy was a little different. They would shift their policy at will any way they liked. At that time the policy was to get them into the YMCA, YWCA, church groups—any groups whereby they could influence. In fact, we, the senior members of the organization, also were requested to do so regardless of under what guise. It did not make any difference.

We had a man by the name of George Sandy. He was a full-time functionary for the party, I guess during the WPA days and up. This

man and I had personal meetings. At the county offices we had meetings together. He met with our group a number of times, and he said, "Now you Communists, you have got one job to do—it does not make a bit of difference under what guise—you get into the general public, get there. If you have to pick on a sewer bond issue, pick on it; go from house to house. Don't tell them you are a Communist, tell them you are a citizen and you are interested, until you are well enough known whereby you can run for city council or whatever office that the public might think that you are fit for." And that was the program at one time.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you very much. I must not take more of the counsel's time.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is all right, Mr. Chairman; it helps develop the picture.

You were describing these various classes which you attended. I believe you said there were still others.

Mr. WEREB. Yes; there were. If you will excuse me a moment, I do have one more I jotted down here that I would like to call the committee's attention to, to one other class here.

Elizabeth Leich Glenn had a series of classes with us and she spoke of manpower. She said, "Well, it is hardly possible to recruit that many men into the Communist Party or into a Communist group that would be a strong manpower group." Therefore, she said, that the party proposed to split this Nation into two nations, creating a nation of the Negroes separate from the whites. This Negro nation who, according to her words, were an oppressed group, would be very easy prey or very easy subjects to this manpower proposition that they had in mind.

Now she spoke of this at two separate classes, and all of a sudden it disappeared. I don't know why, but I did read this in some other Communist literature previous to that time. Somehow or other all of a sudden a little fight over the thing and that was the last of it and we could not follow it up. In my position you could not ask too many questions; you observed and partook in different things. This Negro nation was a very serious move at one time in other clubs because I knew other people in other clubs.

Mr. SCHERER. The Negroes in the Communist Party, and properly so, immediately rose up against any idea of segregation. That was just one of the reasons they immediately abandoned it.

Mr. WEREB. We had no Negroes in our group.

Mr. SCHERER. That was the testimony, I believe, in San Francisco, was it not?

Mr. TAVENNER. We have had testimony in Washington, Milwaukee, and a number of places on this subject. The estimate that Elizabeth Glenn gave that the Negro people would be an easy prey was found out not to be at all prophetic or correct. A great deal of evidence has been introduced showing that they met no substantial measure of success with the persons of the Negro race.

Mr. SCHERER. The evidence is overwhelming that they resisted attempts to infiltrate groups almost better than any other group.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is correct. In many areas that has been the burden of the testimony.

Mr. WEREB. May I add this, Mr. Doyle, that the Negroes that I know and have known over the period of years in the city of Los An-

geles were all fine, upstanding citizens. With the exception of very few, say nine during my whole time of membership in the party—and I don't think they stayed very long—I do not believe that I have known any Negro or person of the Negro race who was a willing prey or would accept such a policy at all. They were too busy trying to make their own way and trying to better themselves.

Mr. DOYLE. I think it appropriate, perhaps, for me to just refer to one paragraph at this point in view of the witness's testimony about revolutionary methods. I read a couple of paragraphs of this decision the other day. This is the decision of the *United States of America v. Title* (17368), civil opinion by the Honorable Judge of the Federal Court in this very building on June 4, 1955, Leon R. Yankwich, United States District Judge, in which a defendant admitted he had been a Communist and was a Communist, and he introduced the constitution of the Communist Party as part of his defense, by the way, to the court.

The court in this case said, among other things:

How anyone can find in them—

referring to the literature of the Communist Party used by the American Communist Party—

any advocacy of lawful means for effectuating the aims of communism or even lip service to democratic institutions is beyond our comprehension, for there is none. As appears more fully from other writings by Lenin which are in the record, in one he states that the proletarian state can only be achieved "through a violent revolution." This is repeated elsewhere.

The Sixth World Congress of the Communist International's held in 1928 states emphatically that Leninism is the dominant approach on that—"the overthrow of capitalism is impossible without force, without armed uprising and proletarian wars against the bourgeoisie." This interpretation is adopted by Stalin, who expresses it in this manner: "The dictatorship of the proletariat is a revolutionary power based on the use of force against the bourgeoisie."

I read that into the record and I repeat that which I have often repeated in this hearing and elsewhere: I do not see how any patriotic American since 1944 or 1945 could possibly have been an active participant in Communist cell meetings such as you attended, sir, without knowing that the primary objective or intention, whenever it suited their convenience, was to build up a philosophy that the American working people were justified in using force against constitutional government.

I repeat it now. I just have never understood how a patriotic American could do that if he ever learned of that objective. The court in this case says, and we know it, that the Communist literature advocated that and still does.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Wereb, what positions have you held in the Communist Party?

Mr. WEREB. I held various positions, sir. I was for a short time, as I said, membership director and Peoples World director, press director, literature director; I was a functionary delegate to all the functionaries conventions. I was a delegate to the Southwest industrial section and—gosh, it has been so long I almost have to look. It was plenty. I was a member of the executive committee; also district manager for the Peoples World in the Southwest section, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. And all this time you were an FBI operator?

Mr. WEREB. That is correct, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Then I suppose you would be classified as a paid informer or stoolpigeon or something like that?

Mr. WEREB. I have been called that.

Mr. DOYLE. I want to compliment you for doing the job you did, whether you were paid or not.

Mr. WEREB. Might I add at this time, sir, that I never was paid a salary by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I had, or rather I would put out and put all bills ahead of time, made donations out of my own pocket to Communist drives, paper drives, the newspaper drives, defense drives, out of my own pocket. I was reimbursed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation after I had given a statement to that effect.

Mr. DOYLE. Only your expenses?

Mr. WEREB. That is all, sir. I have never received 10 cents worth of salary at any time from anyone, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. We congratulate you more than ever if that is the case. I supposed you were paid a little something for it.

Mr. WEREB. Well, I think my freedom, sir, and the honor of calling myself an American citizen is pay enough.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Werek, I asked you at an earlier point in your testimony what security measures were taken by the Communist Party to make sure of you.

Mr. WEREB. At one time—I am trying to find the exact time—two people came to my home: one John Houston. I am trying to find the name of the other person. It was one evening, and I am very anxious to give you the name of that person.

Just one second, sir. I have it among a lot of these notes here. Elsie Monjar. At one time she also ran for city council. The Communist label did not do so good.

Mr. DOYLE. What city?

Mr. WEREB. Los Angeles, sir. These two people came to my home and said, "Pete, what are you doing in the party?" That is not a very easy question to answer, especially when you know that you are under a sham, you are living a life other than what you really believe in. I made them explain just what they meant by it. I asked them a question on a question.

I said, "John, do you have to be a bum to be a Communist?" That question kind of backed him down a little bit. They wanted to know all my progressive record, shall we say; again this bandied word of progressivism. I told them a story that happened to me when I was a young boy. It was of no consequence, but it was a sales idea and it went over. I invited them to examine my home, see if there were any police or Federal Bureau of Investigation documents about. I just told them how, gave them a real sad sob story. After them making me promise an allegiance to the Communist Party and to the Soviet Union, they left satisfied and I stayed on in my regular way. That was a harrowing 2½ hours.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was any question raised about your wife?

Mr. WEREB. Yes, sir. One of the questions that did not seem to have a satisfactory answer in their mind was why my wife was not a Communist. My wife is a very good church member, a very devout person, and it was a very hard thing to think one up, so I said she had a very serious nerve disorder, and therefore for the security of the party in my judgment she should not be a member. That was accepted.

Now to give you a point of just how far they drove this security, a person by the name of Bronson Parrett and Fern Parrett, active Communists—

Mr. TAVENNER. Spell it.

Mr. WEREB. P-a-r-r-o-t, I believe. I would have to check. Would it be all right if I check?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; I think you should make certain as to the spelling of the name.

Mr. WEREB. I will try the best I can, sir. He also was at one time chairman of our group. P-a-r-r-e-t-t, B-r-o-n-s-o-n. His wife was Fern Parrett. Now at one time he got into difficulty with the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a moment. We understand that there may be a little different spelling to that name.

Mr. WEREB. There might be, sir, but that is as close as I can give at the present time. I still haven't found the name. Would you mind if I looked up the name and spelled it?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; and you can give it to us.

Mr. WEREB. All right, sir. I tried to get these names correctly. I have an awful lot of names here. P-a-r-r-e-t-t, Parrett. His wife, Fern Parrett. This man got into a difficulty of some type with the Communist leadership at the higher levels. He kept writing back to the New York office continually and that was objected to by the local group here—that is, the county group. Therefore, he was tried by the Communist security group and banned from the party. His wife stayed on. They approached his wife within a few days of the time they approached me—

Mr. SCHERER. May I interrupt? Did you ever attend one of the trials or hearings where members were barred?

Mr. WEREB. I believe I have, yes, sir, but at this time I would like to leave that for a little later because it would confuse this thought of mine.

Mr. SCHERER. Go ahead.

Mr. WEREB. They went to this woman and told her that unless she divorced her husband they would have to bounce her from the party or kick her out. The woman being a real Communist, as she called herself, did divorce her husband. That was not the only instance. There were many instances like it where they thought that the security of the party was affected by both man and wife not being members; and if both did not wish to be members, none of them could be members.

Mr. DOYLE. In other words, if both did not want to become members of the conspiracy, break up the home?

Mr. WEREB. That is right, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. And the home is the most important unit we have in our Nation of people.

Mr. WEREB. That is right.

Mr. DOYLE. Break them up for the sake of the Communist Party. That is their philosophy, if need be, to further their conspiratorial aims, dastardly objectives.

Mr. WEREB. I believe at one time, to answer your question, Congressman, that I attended a meeting—I did not get into all of the meeting because someone called me out as to the progress of the Peoples World drive. At that time I believe it was one Alice Ward. She called me out. At that time they were trying one Lou—a man from Watts. I believe he also appeared in a number of Smith cases. I am trying to place his last name but it slips my mind a second. I did attend one of those farce trials, a cut and dried affair. He

was an enemy of the workers—they classified him so. Secret literature was made up to the effect and it was dispatched to each club that no one should speak, contact him in any way, shape, manner, or form on any business because he had contact with the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the police department or that he was an enemy of the working classes, and that was that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that individual's name Lou Rosser?

Mr. WEREB. Yes, sir. I know the man by seeing him. I did not recall his name, but that is an outstanding event.

Mr. SCHERER. Lou Rosser was blacklisted from obtaining any employment in certain areas, was he not, or am I wrong?

Mr. TAVENNER. I do not believe I should comment on it.

Mr. SCHERER. I remember his testimony very well.

Mr. DOYLE. Was not Mr. Rosser a Negro?

Mr. WEREB. That is right, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. He was prevented from getting employment, he testified, because of his breaking with the party. They attempted to discredit him with even non-Communist employers. I remember the testimony very well.

Mr. TAVENNER. I failed to ask you a question I intended to ask you. When you were discussing these educational classes which you attended—I want to go back and pick it up—you told the committee about instruction that was received when Mr. Harry Hay came to your club as a teacher sent from the educational commission of the Communist Party. I am not sure whether you told us where that meeting was held.

Mr. WEREB. That meeting was held on Yukon Street at the home of Dan and Eleanor McComb. That was their home. The whole series of classes held by this Harry Hay was conducted at that address.

Mr. TAVENNER. The question I failed to ask you is: Who were present at that meeting, if you can recall?

Mr. WEREB. I would again have to refer to my notes, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well, sir.

Mr. WEREB. By the way, these are my own notes.

Mr. TAVENNER. When I ask who were present, I mean what persons as members of the Communist Party were present.

Mr. WEREB. Yes, sir; I will be happy to give you that. There were John Houston, Vernon Potter, Jack Karson, Edith Smith, Lou Stark, Mike Gorman, G-o-r-m-a-n. John Baldo, B-a-l-d-o; Ed Fitzgerald; Lillian Frong; Laura Lee Musick, M-u-s-i-c-k; Edwin Hagen, H-a-g-e-n; Dan McComb; Ellen Taylor, also known as Mary Rankin. At the present time I believe that is all I have as to that school.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are the spellings which you have given phonetic spellings?

Mr. WEREB. Some may be, sir, but some are not. Some of the spellings I have which are correct would be the spellings that I have taken while I was membership—that is, the Peoples World district manager. Therefore, I would have to have some type of a spelling which was near correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you give a phonetic spelling for the name Laura Lee Musick?

Mr. WEREB. I believe that would be spelled M-u-s-i-c-k, but as I say, some of the spellings in my mind are phonetic, sir, and they are very, very hard to place at the present time as to the exact spelling. I will try my very best and honest best to give you the nearest I possibly can.

Mr. TAVENNER. We want to be as accurate about it as we can. The name Edwin Hagen, as to the spelling of that name, I am wondering whether it is a phonetic spelling you were giving or whether it was what you thought was the true spelling of the name.

Mr. WEREB. That was a true spelling as far as I knew because Mr. Hagen came to my home a number of times and I have read a number of letters that were addressed to him by that name. Therefore, I just copied that, and that is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let us see if we can give some further identifying facts about that individual.

Mr. WEREB. Edwin Hagen was a refugee from Germany, a Communist-banned refugee. He was banned into Holland, and Holland I guess deported him as an undesirable. They deported him to Sweden. These are all according to his stories to me which were verified by his wife whom I met at one time and they laughed over it. Then Sweden deported him to Canada. He stayed a very short time in Canada and he was deported into Mexico and from Mexico he came to this country, and under what circumstances I never did find out, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know where he lived?

Mr. WEREB. I have been to his home at that time. Of course, he no longer lives there. He lived in Inglewood. He was also a very, very close friend of—

Mr. TAVENNER. I would not speak of other persons unless those other persons were members of the Communist Party.

Mr. WEREB. They are members of the Communist Party. In other words, she was the head of the Communist Party at the time of Hagen's last disappearance and that was—she was one of the Smith cases with Schneiderman. That was Dorothy Healy. I met him a number of times at her home.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now you have told us that this group of the Communist Party to which you were assigned was the Hawthorne group.

Mr. WEREB. That is correct, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, who were the officers of that group from time to time as far as you can now recall?

Mr. WEREB. Would it be permissible to read that? I had that prepared because it is hard from memory to remember all the names.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that statement you have a statement which you made at the time of your reports to the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

Mr. WEREB. That is correct, sir. These are all bona fide accepted names as Communists whom I have known and met at closed Communist Party meetings and Communist functions and classes and functionary meetings. These people could not have attended any of these doings unless they were members in good standing in the Communist Party.

Mr. DOYLE. Right at that point, were these meetings conducted under such circumstances that those people would realize they were secret meetings?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, may I call your attention—my question was as to who were the officials at this point. Later I will want to come to that question.

Mr. DOYLE. I withdraw my question at present.

Mr. WEREB. Would it be permissible if I read these names to you?

Mr. TAVENNER. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that he be permitted to examine the list he prepared to refresh his recollection.

Mr. DOYLE. Yes, indeed. These were made in a prompt manner after the meeting?

Mr. WEREB. That is correct.

Mr. DOYLE. For the purpose of your day-to-day record to the FBI?

Mr. WEREB. That is correct.

Mr. DOYLE. This is a record of your own original memorandum you made?

Mr. WEREB. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Certainly it would be good in any court.

Mr. TAVENNER. Before you begin that, it may be well to consider taking the usual recess.

Mr. DOYLE. The committee will stand in recess 5 minutes.

(Whereupon, a short recess was taken.)

(Representatives Doyle, Scherer, and Moulder present after the recess.)

Mr. DOYLE. Let us proceed. Let the record show that 3 members of the subcommittee of 4 are present and therefore a legal quorum is here—Mr. Scherer, of Ohio, Mr. Moulder, of Missouri, and Mr. Doyle, of Los Angeles.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you now proceed to tell the committee who were the officers of the Hawthorne Club of the Communist Party during the period that you were a member of it?

Mr. WEREB. I am trying to find that, sir. I had that here, and to the best of my recollection we have had John Houston—

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a moment.

Mr. WEREB. Do you want the officers?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; the officers first. Is John Houston the same person that you referred to earlier in your testimony?

Mr. WEREB. That is correct, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is the correct spelling of his last name H-o-u-s-t-o-n?

Mr. WEREB. That is right, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think, Mr. Chairman, because of the similarity of names, although there is a difference in spelling, the record should plainly show that this is not John Huston, H-u-s-t-o-n.

Mr. DOYLE. That is correct, Mr. Counsel. The committee appreciates your being careful, just like you always are.

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well, if you will proceed, please.

Mr. WEREB. William Kellas, also chairman; Dan McComb, chairman; Edith Smith, membership secretary and dues secretary. They are the same, only known under different names. Literature agent. Ola Pacifico. Eleanor Taylor.

Mr. TAVENNER. Spell the name, please.

Mr. WEREB. P-a-c-i-f-i-c-o, O-l-a. Eleanor Taylor. Also financial director, Eleanor Taylor again. Marion Stark, educational director; Jack Karson, chairman.

Mr. TAVENNER. How does he spell the name?

Mr. WEREB. K-a-r-s-o-n.

Mr. MOULDER. In addition to the spelling of the name, can you give further identification?

Mr. WEREB. The man at one time——

Mr. MOULDER. I mean as to any and all of those names. There may be a dozen people by the same name when you name one. Where he resided, his occupation.

Mr. WEREB. Occupation was helper, and he was also employed by the board of education at one time as a truckdriver and later became helper to his brother in the plumbing business.

Mr. MOULDER. His approximate age?

Mr. WEREB. He was approximately 40 years old at the time I knew him, and also he was a lieutenant in the Abraham Lincoln Brigade during the Spanish civil war, sir. He was a known Communist for many, many years.

Mr. MOULDER. Where did he reside at that time?

Mr. WEREB. He resided in Hawthorne, Calif. I am no longer familiar with the street addresses because there may be other people living at those addresses at the present time and it might be embarrassing to some of those people. That is why I do not like to give out street numbers, sir. These, to my recollection, were the officers at different times, various periods during my 4 years as a party member in Hawthorne and Inglewood.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have testified that you were a member of the executive committee at one time.

Mr. WEREB. I was a member of the executive committee within 3 weeks of my party affiliation.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, who served on the executive committee of the Hawthorne group of the Communist Party with you? And in giving their names, as suggested by a member of the committee, it would be well for you to give us much identifying information as you can recall so there will be no possible mistake of identity of the individuals.

Mr. WEREB. Ola Pacifico. She was with the health department of the county for a time and refused to take the loyalty oath and therefore she now is a private individual. Marion Stark, the wife of one Lou Stark, of Hawthorne, Calif.

Dan McComb, worker in the airplane industry for a while, a barber, a student, and Lord knows what else.

Edith Smith, a housewife and a bookkeeper for a short time with a concern which I do not recall at this time.

Eleanor Taylor, a housewife of Inglewood.

Mike Gorman. Mike Gorman was a jack-of-all-trades, master of none. He tried to repair clocks, radios. The last I heard, he never made the grade on any of those. He was originally from New York.

Vernon L. Potter, a carpenter, for a time known as a contractor for himself, too. He also lived in Hawthorne.

Louis Stark, the husband of Marion Stark, of the previously mentioned Hawthorne group.

Ed Hagen——

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a moment. You may as well identify at this time, if you can, just what his activity was in the Communist Party, if you can tell us.

Mr. WEREB. Louis Stark was a liaison man of the Communist Party between the different political groups in our district, doing regional

as well as municipal, county, or otherwise, and I believe, if I remember correctly, he was at one time a member of the Democratic central committee. His job was not to be known as a Communist but act as, shall we say—this is an unwelcome word—a liberal or a progressive representing those groups and acting as a liaison officer on anything that the party wanted to put over or any candidate the party wished to put over—any political program they might have had in mind which was also always on issues, never general political. They never accepted the Democrat or the Republican or the other principles in toto. They always picked on the issue and played the issue up because they thought that was the easiest key to the door they finally wanted to open.

Mr. MOULDER. May I interrupt? You say you believe he was a member of the Democratic central committee. Do you know positively of your own personal knowledge he was?

Mr. WEREB. I believe I have read that, sir, but I never saw him there.

Mr. MOULDER. You do not know, you just heard it?

Mr. WEREB. I read it.

Mr. MOULDER. Read it where?

Mr. WEREB. I read it in the circulars that were put out by different election committees and different drive committees of different parties. I have seen his name on it, and he also reported to us in person at the party that he was a member of the Democratic central committee of that district.

Mr. MOULDER. What period was that?

Mr. WEREB. That was the period of 1945, 1946, 1947, sir; latter part of 1945. I am sorry, I do not mean to take any political party because I do not want—it is just an instance I wish to use there as he used to further himself and the party program. I do not wish to be disrespectful to any political party, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether at a subsequent date he became active in any other political group?

Mr. WEREB. Yes, he did. He became very active in the Independent Progressive Party, the IPP. I never was a member, so I would not know.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you tell the committee of any action that was taken by the Communist Party at any of its meetings regarding the Independent Progressive Party?

Mr. WEREB. For a time the Communist Party tried to run candidates of their own. For instance, Archie Brown ran for governor of the State, and I do not believe anybody saw it outside of the party. I do not believe he got any more votes than the party. So the Communist Party decided that a third party was necessary, that it is imperative; they cannot run it as a Communist Party because it would not be acceptable to the average liberal group. Therefore, they decided that they would have another party. This party at the time was not identified. Later it became known by the literature that was brought to the club by this Lou Stark that the IPP was a constituted political party, and he was very active in this group. That is about all I can tell you on that, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well. If you will proceed with your—

Mr. WEREB. Pardon me. Just one more addition to that. It was with party approval and it was a party “must” that every member

go out and distribute all the literature, attend all IPP meetings; it was a "must." In other words, the hands were asked for at every club meeting which were closed Communist meetings, how many were going and how many were not. Somebody that did not raise their hands had to have a pretty good excuse, such as work or no one to leave the baby with or something of that sort in order not to participate in any of the IPP drives—mobilizations, call it whatever you like.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now will you proceed in your description of the membership of the executive committee of the Hawthorne Club?

Mr. WEREB. We had this Ed Hagen as a member of the executive committee. For a very short time we had a man named Earl Kelly from the Redondo group and a Mickey Johnson who was very active in the El Segundo group, which also was part of the Hawthorne-Inglewood general group.

Bert Coffee, C-o-f-f-e-e. He was known as an organizer of the oil workers; also came with credentials of the Communist Party to the executive meeting and became part of the executive committee at the time they had the strike at the Standard Oil Co. at El Segundo. He directed, with the assistance of the rest of the Communist group, the activities, the literature distribution, the picket line walking; and the progress of the strike was also directed by him.

Mr. TAVENNER. You testified at some length regarding his activity in the hearings at San Diego last year, I believe.

Mr. WEREB. I did, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Does that complete the list of the executive committee?

Mr. WEREB. Yes, of the executive committee, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you make a record of the membership of the Hawthorne Club of the Communist Party during the period of your work for the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

Mr. WEREB. I certainly did, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you advise the committee, please, as to that membership—but in doing so, let me ask you, to be certain that any name you identify, that you do it on the basis of your own personal knowledge of their membership on the Communist Party.

Mr. WEREB. Do you want me to read the names now?

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a moment. And in making such identification, give us such descriptive information of the individual as you can so that should there be another person of a similar name or the same name, that description you would give would properly identify the person you are speaking of.

Mr. WEREB. I will try that, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right.

Mr. WEREB. Membership of the Hawthorne-Inglewood, El Segundo, Redondo Beach, and bay area groups, official membership that I have seen numbers for which I cannot give you at this time, I do not have those numbers, but these parties' membership cards I have seen with my own eyes and I have seen these people at different Communist meetings.

Mr. TAVENNER. Communist meetings, what type of Communist meetings?

Mr. WEREB. Closed meetings and closed meetings only.

Mr. DOYLE. How do you know they were closed meetings?

Mr. WEREB. Being a member of the executive committee, I believe I had something to do with it that we had nothing but Communists in that meeting or if it was a functionaries meeting, sir, it was up to the credentials committees and those governing the attendance to see to it that everyone had proper credentials before entering any of these meetings. There were no haphazard accounts of any of these names.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right, sir.

Mr. WEREB. Claf Johnson, an elderly man employed by the Navy Department at Seattle, a warehouseman, lived near me in Inglewood.

Lillian Frong, F-r-o-n-g, a housewife, in the Westchester area, I believe.

Lawrence Pacifico, ex-soldier—that I know—and went to school out at the college, El Camino College, as a student under the GI bill.

Nathan Strout, an elderly man, a violin teacher. S-t-r-o-u-t.

Gene Chriss, a member of the New York group of the Communist Party, of the San Joaquin Valley group and finally the Los Angeles-Hawthorne and El Segundo group.

Mr. TAVENNER. You gave the spelling of the last name earlier, but will you give it again?

Mr. WEREB. C-h-r-i-s-s, G-e-n-e. Gene Chriss was also a P. W. director and district manager after the district was split up into a number of groups.

Mr. TAVENNER. What do you mean by P. W. director?

Mr. WEREB. Peoples World director.

Sally Chriss, housewife, his wife, who lived on Aviation Boulevard as his wife.

Dave Chriss: The father of Gene Chriss, elderly man.

Barney Frong: An aviation worker.

Pauline Sullivan: Redondo Beach, a housewife.

Dave Belt, B-e-l-t: A contract cesspool digger.

Ida Karson, K-a-r-s-o-n: The wife of Jack Karson, the man I spoke of as being a lieutenant in the Abraham Lincoln Brigade.

Adrienne Fein, F-e-i-n: A housewife, very active in another organization known as the IWO.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is the first name Adrienne, or is that Mrs. Adrian?

Mr. WEREB. That is Mrs. Adrienne. I want to apologize for omitting this. In the party we never call anybody Mr. or Mrs. and it is natural for me to omit them. I am sorry.

Mr. TAVENNER. The point I want to get clear is whether the first name Adrian is the name of the husband or is it the wife's first name?

Mr. WEREB. That is the wife's first name.

Jack Good: Occupation unknown.

I. M. Tomren, T-o-m-r-e-n: This man was a retired old man, kind of helpless, but a member.

Ruth Schorr, S-c-h-o-r-r, lived in another district. She was very active in a labor group somewhere.

Pat Ruso: A mystery character. He would go and disappear and come back and the club or group or county never seemed to ask why. He was about 38 years old, and the only way I could identify him, he was of Italian origin, I believe, and that is all.

Morrey Korngold. M-o-r-r-e-y K-o-r-n-g-o-l-d, a printer or printer's helper, of the Westchester area. His wife Rochelle Korngold, R-o-c-h-e-l-l-e.

Jules Tanzman, T-a-n-z-m-a-n: A merchant in surplus merchandise.
Mr. MOULDER. Where?

Mr. WEREB. His residence was Inglewood or Westchester, and his business was located on Santa Fe Street in the 2600 block. He specialized in surplus aluminum.

Rudy Love: He was an indigent loafer here and there, and that is all. He had no occupation or no connection whatsoever.

David B. Glass: The partner of Jules Tanzman in the same surplus business.

Ellen McComb: Wife of Dan McComb, housewife.

Jerry Kramer, K-r-a-m-e-r: Aircraft worker, Westchester District.

Elsie Mancar, M-a-n-c-a-r: Full-time employee of the United Mine, Mill and Smelter Union as a secretary. Also, executive secretary to the southwest section of the industrial section of the Los Angeles County Communist Party.

Don Healy, former husband of Dorothy Healy.

Fern Parrett: The lady referred to as the person who had to divorce her husband because of non-Communist membership after the discharge of the man.

Laura Lee Musick——

Mr. SCHERER. Pardon me. Do you know whether in that divorce case that was mentioned as a ground for divorce?

Mr. WEREB. Not in the United States courts, I do not believe, but in the Communist trial it was. You see, she was tried by a special committee giving her the choice of either staying in the party, sir, or divorcing her husband. That still is a trial and a security trial known by the Communists as such.

Mr. SCHERER. I was referring to the divorce court.

Mr. WEREB. I do not believe our local courts would accept that.

Mr. DOYLE. You mean the Communist cell of which you were or one of the committees——

Did you ever hear any Communist Party member in a Communist Party trial or meeting claim that he did not have to testify because it might incriminate him?

Mr. WEREB. No, sir; there is no such a thing in the Communist Party, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. No such thing as declining——

Mr. WEREB. That is a dictatorship in toto.

Mr. DOYLE. There is no such thing as having the constitutional privilege in the Communist Party?

Mr. WEREB. There is no constitutional privilege.

Mr. DOYLE. They are American citizens most of them.

Mr. MOULDER. Every one understands that. You say you were not there and you do not personally have any knowledge of this occurrence other than by hearsay?

Mr. WEREB. I have a person also at that trial by the name of Mickey Johnson who came to me and said she was a member of that investigative or whatever trial body, and she told me so.

Mr. MOULDER. I am not trying to discredit you or question whether or not that occurred, but it is just bringing up the proposition that you did not know it yourself.

Mr. DOYLE. My question was directed because I wanted to know the method they used in Communist Party trials.

Mr. MOULDER. He says he was not there. I do not know how he would know.

Mr. WEREB. I sat through 21½ hours of one of those trial ordeals by John Houston and Elsie Mancar, and I need not be anywhere else to know what goes on. With me it was just like anybody else, no different. When it came to party security and party progress, no one stood in the way, whether it was Browder or whoever. It did not make any difference. It was the party or else.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you.

Mr. WEREB. Where did I stop on the last name?

Mr. TAVENNER. Don Healy, I believe, was the last name.

Mr. WEREB. He was the ex-husband of one Dorothy Healy, a Smith Act case.

Fern Parrett is the woman I just referred to.

Laura Lee Musick: A housewife, M-u-s-i-c-k.

Barney Frong: I believe he was an aircraft worker.

Marion Hart: I saw her card, but I do not recall what her occupation was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether she has another name?

Mr. WEREB. I believe most of those people had another name, but I do not recall just at the present moment.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right.

Mr. WEREB. Alice Elconin, wife of a union organizer of some type. I do not know, but I think he was connected with the Electrical Workers Union or something. Alice Elconin—she was recruited by Ruth Schorr, and this took place at the home of Morrey and Rochelle Korngold in the early part of 1947. That is the only way I can identify the lady.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is the spelling of the last name?

Mr. WEREB. E-l-c-o-n-i-n.

Mr. TAVENNER. Would that membership have been during the period of World War II?

Mr. WEREB. I believe World War II was over in 1947.

Mr. TAVENNER. I did not understand; I thought you said it began earlier.

Mr. WEREB. Early part of 1947 at the home of Morrey Korngold and Rochelle Korngold.

Mr. TAVENNER. I misunderstood the date.

Mr. WEREB. Processed and brought to the meeting by one Ruth Schorr.

Byron Taylor, a merchant marine.

Floyd Wallace: I believe he was an auto mechanic, husband of Shevey Wallace, a fulltime Los Angeles County Communist Party employee. S-h-e-v-e-y—I believe that is the spelling.

Sybil Ward, an aircraft worker.

Charles C. Watkins, retired mailman. He delivered mail in that district.

Mrs. Mel Wilkerson, housewife.

Blanche Zamudio, a member in the east side; Z-a-m-u-d-i-o.

Ed Bodner: I do not recall too much of the man at the present time or his occupation. I may later on.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is the spelling of the last name?

Mr. WEREB. I believe it is B-o-d-n-e-r.

Steve Adams, for a while an aircraft worker, later engaged in business for himself in machinist work.

Rose Mary Bennick, B-e-n-n-i-c-k, housewife.

John Biluk, B-i-l-u-k. I think he is an aircraft worker.

Cary Cain, president. I do not know what his trade or what he was.

Alice Cantu, C-a-n-t-u, housewife.

Wayne Cantu.

Mel Christiansen: I do not recall what his connection was, but he was in the district in the Hawthorne-Inglewood group.

Leo Clark, insurance salesman.

Araby Colton, C-o-l-t-o-n, A-r-a-b-y; housewife. For a while employed at one of the aircraft companies.

Victor Colton, her husband; shipyard worker.

Edith Dexter, housewife; Inglewood district.

Mansell Dexter: He was a mechanic of some type.

Louis Emery, E-m-e-r-y.

Mr. TAVENNER. Which spelling of Louis is used?

Mr. WEREB. L-o-u-i-s.

Herb Evans, industrial worker in the Hawthorne group.

Ruth Evans, housewife. That is his wife.

Pen Vandervoort, P-e-n, V-a-n-d-e-r-v-o-o-r-t, private secretary.

Susan Vandervoort, wife; same spelling. Housewife.

I believe I have here a little addition of a few more names.

Sam Fujimoto, F-u-j-i-m-o-t-o. I think he was a truck gardener.

Florence Goldman, Inglewood district; transferee from the Young Communist League.

George Hawks, a shipyard worker; H-a-w-k-s.

Wenzel Lehr, W-e-n-z-e-l, L-e-h-r, industrial worker. I believe he was in the Hawthorne district there.

Gerda Leiva, G-e-r-d-a, L-e-i-v-a, an elderly lady living alone in, I believe, Redondo or the next town further, I guess, Manhattan district.

Carl Pekstan, C-a-r-l, P-e-k-s-t-a-n; occupation unknown.

Frank Phieffer, P-h-i-e-f-f-e-r. I do not know his occupation, but he was of the Inglewood district.

Earl Pinkston, Westchester district; P-i-n-k-s-t-o-n.

Ruth Smith, housewife; fulltime Communist.

Mr. MOULDER. May I intervene here? As an illustration of what I had in mind a while ago, I venture to say probably in the great metropolitan area of Los Angeles there are very likely 15 or 20 people by the name of Ruth Smith, a housewife. The naming and publication of that name will be a reflection upon each of them unless there is some definite—

Mr. WEREB. Hawthorne district. I referred to Edith Smith, Ruth Smith—same family, same group, same occupation as far as communism was concerned. I believe at one time she was an Army nurse. I believe that; I do not know that to be a fact. Daughter of Edith Smith. I met her and I knew her to be—I went to Edith Smith's home on the average of twice a week for the period of 3 or 4 years, and I believe I would know her.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you locate the home?

Mr. WEREB. I think the number was, if you must have it—

Mr. DOYLE. Without giving the number, give the general location. Somebody else may live there now.

Mr. WEREB. It was in Imperial and Hawthorne Boulevard district, in the immediate vicinity of.

Peggy Vaughn, a schoolteacher, V-a-u-g-h-n.

Tony Talon, T-a-l-o-n, industrial aircraft worker of some type. This was the membership of the Hawthorne Communist group, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. You referred to a person by the name of Vaughn. What was her first name?

Mr. WEREB. Peggy. That was her party name, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. That was her party name?

Mr. WEREB. That was the name that I knew her by. At the time I knew her, the party did not exactly ban the correct names unless it was for some activity that the party did not want you to be known in.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give us further identifying information relating to her?

Mr. WEREB. She was a schoolteacher in the Los Angeles Board of Education District. She was a person about 5 foot, if I recall right. She had light chestnut hair; weighed, I would say, a hundred five pounds. She was very active in Communist circles as to education. She was very much displeased with the changeover of the Communist Party of America, to the phony we had there at one time known as the Communist Political Association. When that change came she transferred from our group to what is known—they cut the groups up into language groups; they cut them into industrial groups; they cut them into shop groups; they cut them into teachers, artists, different union groups. Then I lost track of her after that, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is adequate.

Mr. WEREB. That was the total membership, to the best of my knowledge, of the Hawthorne-Inglewood and bay area Communist groups. These are taken from my own notes that I have saved over a period of time that I was with the Federal Bureau of Investigation as their undercover man.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DOYLE. Yes, Mr. Moulder.

Mr. MOULDER. The spirit in which I question you is not at all in the spirit of doubting your testimony or anything that you have said as to be the exact truth as you have testified to it, but the purpose of it is this: The question which I wish to ask you is this: You have named approximately how many people?

Mr. WEREB. Approximately a hundred in that group, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. A hundred people as having been affiliated and actively affiliated with the Communist Party and its activities over a certain period of time. Each of those parties named will be published in the newspapers, are going to be, revealed in that light with great injury to themselves wherever they may reside, doing great damage to them and their reputation, just as severely as if they had been tried in a court of law and convicted. To a degree, that is the result.

Now, you have stated that each one of those that you have named was in attendance at closed party meetings. Can you state the time and place as to each one of those persons and the occasion that you recall when they did so attend and to what degree they did participate in Communist Party functions and affairs?

Mr. WEREB. I believe, sir, that I have separated those who were in the executive meetings. Executive meetings were held every week of the year, sir. Then membership meetings were held every other week.

Some groups met once a month. It would be humanly impossible to take each and every one of these people, sir, and put them into any special one meeting unless there was any special activity whereby their names stood out in my mind or stood out as to they have acted in a violent manner, taught or advocated personally those instances—yes, I probably could give you time and dates on those. But these other general memberships, sir, it would be humanly impossible to place these people at different meetings.

Mr. MOULDER. Were the meetings held at different places?

Mr. WEREB. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. At those meetings, did you record the names of those present from which you now present the names before this committee?

Mr. WEREB. That is correct, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. You took notes during the meetings or immediately after the meetings?

Mr. WEREB. I did, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Which way?

Mr. WEREB. Sometimes mental, sometimes match covers, sometimes back of Peoples World. I can say that I have a fairly good memory, sir, and when the meeting was over and when I delivered my charges—I had to pick up a number of indigents who had no transportation, delivered them home—I searched my mind just like I was on trial, who was there. That one thing, I did not know who else was checking up on me, too. Therefore, I could not possibly make a mistake because someone would call me on it in a hurry or say, Who was such and such person?

I do not believe during the 4 years or over I have acted in that capacity that I have made an error because there were a number of others who would check on others, too. I was not the only one. Therefore, say the police department had their intelligence men there and they do compare notes, you know; I didn't, but they do. Therefore, it was very important to me that I would minimize rather than exaggerate.

Mr. MOULDER. I am sure of that. Now you say each of those persons named attended regularly at closed Communist Party meetings.

Mr. WEREB. Over the period of 4 years; yes, sir. There was no one person outside of probably myself that attended every meeting. The only meeting I missed during that period, sir, was a time I had very serious surgery and I had to miss it because I could not possibly go that way. But outside of that, I made sure there was no such thing. I never went to bed any morning until a full report was written out while fresh in my mind from the notes and no chance for error and no chance for dreaming overnight that did not happen. Sometimes I did not get to bed before 4 or 5 o'clock in the morning, and that is what broke my health, I put in so much time. I would go to the embassy, 150 names of people present, or at the Shrine auditorium or any doings at 2200, which is a favorite haunt.

Mr. MOULDER. The testimony now before the committee has just covered the Hawthorne area?

Mr. WEREB. That is right, just the Hawthorne area. I got more.

Mr. TAVENNER. You submitted the reports that you prepared of each meeting to the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

Mr. WEREB. I did, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I understand you to say that other people were doing the same thing.

Mr. WEREB. Possibly. I did not know any, but possibly there were because I do not really believe the Federal Bureau of Investigation would rely on just one person, or the sheriff's office or the police department. They probably did not even know I existed. But these were all persons whose names I have given you, sir, who were at closed Communist functions and meetings where no one else can appear but Communists in good standing as far as the Communist Party is concerned.

Mr. MOULDER. I think you have made a very careful and accurate record.

Mr. WEREB. I was very careful about it because I was very conscious of the fact that people did not get smeared, and it is something—words you can say, you can never take back. It is just like water; if you spill water, you can never pick it up.

Mr. MOULDER. I believe you have performed your duty very carefully.

Mr. WEREB. Thank you, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask one question of this witness before we adjourn for luncheon?

Mr. WEREB. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. You have testified, both in your original statement and then in answers to my question and others, that definitely there was revolutionary propaganda and program spoken of by these instructors at these classes who came to your group from the county educational level. Then I questioned you as to whether or not that included statements by these instructors from the county level of the Communist Party that there would be force necessary eventually to overthrow the capitalistic system.

Now, up until the time you left the party, did you ever hear any instructor from the county level or any other level in the Communist Party tell your cell when you were present that they had changed their revolutionary line? In other words, did they stop teaching that function?

Mr. WEREB. To a peaceful line?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes.

Mr. WEREB. No, sir. The works of Lenin, if anyone has read, and I was compelled to read some of it, sir, the works of Lenin will tell you the method of revolution, sir; the method of violence.

Mr. DOYLE. I know that, sir.

Mr. WEREB. They cannot practice anything, but Marxism teaches you what, Leninism tells you how to—how to force it.

Mr. DOYLE. You attended meetings almost every week or so. Anyone attending the meetings which you attended of the Communist Party, the closed meetings in the Hawthorne-Inglewood area, more or less during the period which you attended—what is your answer to the question whether or not it would have been possible, or probable, put it that way—would have been probable that any adult attending those meetings in that cell such as you attended over that period of 3 or 4 years could possibly have attended more or less regularly without hearing instruction that sooner or later there would be force and violence needed?

Mr. WEREB. It would be impossible for this reason, sir, not to hear, because when you joined the Communist Party, sir, you were sent to a Marxist class of some type, whether club level or downtown level, and therefore they would teach you this tenet. In other words, this creed they teach it to you; and if you attend Communist Party meetings more than 3 or 4 times, unless you are a—pardon the expression—nitwit, you could not help but know it was a revolutionary group that had as its purpose the overthrow of the United States Government by force and violence.

Mr. DOYLE. Of course, some of those in attendance might have just figured that was a sort of theoretical philosophy rather than anything they intended to put into practice, could they not?

Mr. WEREB. To prove practice in that respect, Mr. Doyle, you have to take this into consideration. It was not only the teaching but the actual practice of mobilization in the Communist Party which demonstrated its worth, its power, and its position. Even if you went out on a newspaper drive, they would say it was a mobilization, to mobilize forces to bring about—that is No. 1. If you went out to distribute leaflets, there was a leaflet distribution mobilization. Everything pertaining to anything that they know of—if I were to go out and distribute literature of any kind, I would say it is a literature distribution in favor of or against. When you are constantly reminded that this is a party activity, this is a must, this is a mobilization, you could not very well be stupid enough, no one could be stupid enough, to not know what they were doing.

Mr. DOYLE. That explains to me again one reason why so many people plead the fifth amendment, because they heard that sort of philosophy talked and they did it with their eyes open. Now and then I find one that was asleep with his eyes open, but generally not. I asked you that question because I surmise there will be other witnesses from that area today or tomorrow who may plead the fifth amendment, and I just want to understand some of the reasons why they might. Your testimony today makes me understand why they do, because it might incriminate them.

Mr. WEREB. I have omitted here about 10 very important names from this group. I wonder if it would be all right to call them.

Mr. TAVENNER. Which group?

Mr. WEREB. Ten very important names from this group I have omitted which I would like to identify at this time, if you can give me 5 minutes.

Mr. DOYLE. Are these people personally known to you to be members of the Communist Party?

Mr. WEREB. Yes, very important people.

Mr. DOYLE. To your personal knowledge?

Mr. WEREB. That is right, sir; those who contributed to the Communist effort.

Mr. DOYLE. I think we ought to hear the witness on these positive identifications. We are not going to shield any of them.

Mr. WEREB. Eleanor Potter, the wife of the Vernon L. Potter; Bronson Parrett, this man who was tossed from the Communist Party for certain reasons: Charles Karson, brother of Morris Karson, brother of Jack Karson.

The Karson family are in the plumbing business in the southwest side somewhere or in the Adams district. I would not know, but that is the last I knew where they were active; Gladys Houston, the wife of one John Houston, H-o-u-s-t-o-n, a housewife. Contributed her efforts as to mailing, typing—whatever work, literary work, was necessary.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was she the wife of the same John Houston you identified as chairman of the group?

Mr. WEREB. That is right. Henry Garrish, a self-styled aviation mechanic; Georgiana Garrish, the mother of Henry Garrish; John Garrish, same family at the Paseo de Gracia address; Laura R. Garrish; Onya Fisher, O-n-y-a F-i-s-h-e-r; Ed Fisher. I believe the Fishers were aircraft workers of some type. I do not know their exact—they are from the Hawthorne district.

These are the last few names I omitted from our group which was a little over a hundred there at one time.

Mr. DOYLE. You have given us these names as contributors to the Communist Party?

Mr. WEREB. Any time you contribute effort, time, or moneys and carry a Communist card, sir, you are a Communist.

Mr. DOYLE. Did they carry cards?

Mr. WEREB. Yes, most of them.

Mr. DOYLE. Are any people of that group that you knew not members of the Communist Party?

Mr. WEREB. They were members of the Communist Party of that group at one time or another during that 4-year period.

Mr. DOYLE. The 4-year period beginning when and ending when?

Mr. WEREB. I would say January 1944 to the first of January 1948.

Mr. DOYLE. They were members, all of them, from time to time of the same group you were a member of?

Mr. WEREB. Yes, same group; either transferred in or transferred out.

Mr. DOYLE. You sat in closed meetings with them?

Mr. WEREB. Yes, sir; I was one of the executive committee members, and therefore I had to be there.

Mr. DOYLE. We will adjourn until 2 o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 12:20 p. m., a recess was taken until 2 p. m., of the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION—JULY 1, 1955

(At the reconvening of the hearing after the noon recess, Representatives Doyle, Moulder, and Scherer were present.)

Mr. DOYLE. The committee will please reconvene. Let the record show that Congressman Scherer, of Ohio; Congressman Moulder, of Missouri; and Congressman Doyle, of California, are present.

This morning at 12:20, Mr. Counsel, we recessed until 2 o'clock, and it is now just exactly 2 o'clock. Again this afternoon I know we will have the very fine cooperation of everyone in the room, neither making any demonstration for anything that harms or against anything that happens by way of approbation. Thank you very much.

TESTIMONY OF STEPHEN A. WEREB—Resumed

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. WerEB, we have heard through an earlier witness during these hearings of the activities of the Communist Party in an early period of the history of the Communist Party in this area in the field of veterans' work. During the period that you were active in the Communist Party in behalf of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, did you observe any activities among veterans or veterans' organizations?

Mr. WEREB. Yes, I did, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like for you to tell the committee, please, what you observed.

Mr. WEREB. A man by the name of Stanley Chemiel who was known as a Communist came to an executive committee meeting. This will have to be phonetic, or as close as possible. Stanley was his first name, C-h-e-m-i-e-l. That is as close as I could get to that name. He was a real-estate broker, and I do not know what else around the city. He came and he said that the party was very much interested in the veterans and gaining enough veterans with military experience, and they were thinking of establishing a group similar to the American Legion or the AMVETS or the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and that they would give this a new name.

Again they dragged out the liberal, progressive name and said the other veterans' organizations were reactionary and Fascist-minded and therefore they would try to institute a new organization.

In the South Bay area at that time a party by the name of Jack Kramer, K-r-a-m-e-r—this is the same Kramer I previously mentioned as a member of the Hawthorne Communist group—Mike Gorman and Pete Johnson—Johnson—by the way this was at his home, and Johnson was a Communist of long record. At one time at my home he said that during the riot somewhere in Joliet or somewhere he hoisted the Red flag above the city hall and tore down the American flag. These were the type of people that held the meeting and were going to start this new organization.

At that time they named it the American Veterans Committee. I am a veteran and do not know anything about it, never belonged to them. They had quite a meeting. A committee was appointed to represent the group, and in that committee was a Mike Gorman and P. Johnson representing the Hawthorne group. Being Peoples World director at that time and district manager, I was left out of the further proceedings. But the next general meeting that I know of the veterans—

Mr. TAVENNER. Before you come to the next general meeting, you said that the principal instigator was a person named Stanley Chemiel.

Mr. WEREB. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether he used any other name?

Mr. WEREB. I do not believe I do, sir. This is the only name I ever knew the man by. He was one that represented the group.

The next meeting was held in the Venus area, and after that there was, I believe on Vermont Avenue somewhere, a very large meeting held. Only through newspapers and through the Peoples World did I follow the progress of this American Veterans Committee. The Peoples World, of course being very friendly to it, immediately pointed out to me that, well, things could be different and they should be different as far as veterans' organizations are concerned.

At subsequent meetings of the group and the functionaries, the American Veterans Committee always received firsthand attention because they did put up a veterans' commission in the functionaries of the Los Angeles County Communist organization. So in the future when I mention Los Angeles County, I do not mean the State or the county organization of our instituted Government, but I mean the Communist Party. Further from that, of course, I could not be interested because I had too many other duties to do. Someone else probably took up where I left off, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. You gave us a list of the positions which you held in the Communist Party. I do not believe that any of those positions were on a county or State level, were they?

Mr. WEREB. Any functionary attending any of the county functions, meetings, is considered as a working part of the Communist functionary group. You are not one of the county committee board members, but you do function as an active functionary in your district.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you ever function in that capacity?

Mr. WEREB. I did, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you describe that to the committee?

Mr. WEREB. One of the functions I would like to call your attention to was in the month of June, I believe, 1945. I was given credentials by the club chairman, John Houston. This was printed by the Los Angeles County Communist Board, and it was signed. With these credentials I attended what was known as the southwest section, southern section of the State of California Convention of the Communist Party. That was held in the Danish Hall around 24th or 25th Street, a few doors east of Vermont Avenue. This was approximately the month of June in 1945.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the purpose of that meeting?

Mr. WEREB. Prior to the meeting there was a copy of a letter or a printed form of a letter that was submitted to each group known as the Duclos letter. This Duclos letter was a speech that was written by a French Communist by the name of Duclos in France criticizing the Browder regime at that time for its semicooperation with capitalism and capitalist governments.

An educational, which is held 1 hour of each meeting of the regular membership of each group, was held prior to this and the oldtimers—the old revolutionaries—were very elated that the letter appeared. They thought they would send their best representatives of the group to this doing. I attended that, entered the auditorium on the second floor with this pass.

Mr. TAVENNER. With this what?

Mr. WEREB. With this credential pass. There were about 350 to 400 people present at this, and they were all functionaries. There could be no one that would enter that group without a pass, an official pass.

Mr. TAVENNER. What means were adopted to be certain that those present had proper credentials?

Mr. WEREB. There were these passes, and if you did not have a credential card you were sent to a committee room to be identified. I happened to be fortunate enough to be elected to the credentials committee with Emily Gordon and Max Silver—the three of us were on the credentials committee—and there we had to identify or someone

had to identify a person who had no Communist credentials but who was a known and active Communist.

There, sir, I met a man who was brought into that room whom I identified as Ring Lardner, Jr. He came into that room and Max Silver identified the man and vouched for him. Therefore, we seated him with the Hollywood delegation.

This meeting went on for a day, full day, and a night. There were new chairmen elected to this group and, as I said before, they were all active functionaries of the Communist Party. Different people approached microphones located at strategic positions on the convention floor. I believe there were 5, 1 for the speaker and 2 in each aisle. As these members would come up, they would come up with a prepared text praising the Duclos letter and damning Browder but darn good.

The very first speaker that I recall was William Schneiderman, a Smith Act case. He stood there before these 400 delegates and said he was very sorry that he had cooperated with the Browder revisionism and that if the party would elect him or appoint him as the head of the State Communist group, he would try to be more militant and lead the party to a more militant role.

Next came, I believe, Dorothy Healy. She was always revolutionary. She just went on down the line staying with the rest.

Paul Cline, who at one time was assistant editor of the Peoples World, approached the microphone and he also confessed to his revisionist attitude and prepared to be and promised to be more revolutionary.

Max Silver made a very feeble effort, but he was the head of the Los Angeles County Communist Party during the Browder administration, so he was doomed and he knew it.

Next came a person by the name—

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to refresh the recollection of the committee on the point of Max Silver.

Mr. DOYLE. He has testified and cooperated with this committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. He testified before the committee that when he saw this letter for the first time, which I believe was at breakfast, he stated to his wife that that letter was the equivalent of a declaration of war and that the only thing that was uncertain was the time at which the war would occur. He laid his plans then, as soon as he saw that letter, to get out of the Communist Party, which he did.

Mr. MOULDER. Declaration of war by what country?

Mr. TAVENNER. By the Soviet Union.

Mr. WEREB. It is very true that Mr. Silver made a very feeble effort to defend himself.

The next speaker was a person by the name of Buth Goldstein, G-o-l-d-s-t-e-i-n, I believe. This man stood in the center of the auditorium—I beg your pardon; the right side of the auditorium—and stated he was a Communist for 11 years; that he was a sergeant in the Abraham Lincoln Brigade; that he served under the command of one Jack Karson, previously mentioned as a member of the Hawthorne group, who was a lieutenant in this group. He could not understand why the Communist Party of the United States ever sunk to the level of cooperation, revisionism, and he demanded that there would be a revolution of the workers of this country; that there would be established a dictatorship of the proletariat. With that, when he finished, he got quite an ovation.

The next speaker was a man by the name of Ray Durant, also identified himself. As to his Communist membership and leadership, beat his breast like the rest of them, I guess, about how sorry they were about revisionism. He promised a very much more militant role. He demanded that in the resolution of the day, which was to be drawn up by the resolutions committee of that group, that it be embodied, his demand, that there would be an overthrow of the United States Government and the establishment of a dictatorship of the proletariat. With that, the whole group gave him a terrific, terrific sendoff. He really got quite an applause.

That is one of the functions that I have attended.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee has heard evidence a number of times about the purpose of the Duclos letter and the result of the Duclos letter, but I believe this is the first time we have had an eyewitness account of a meeting in a locality describing the participation that people took in the deliberations.

May I ask you whether or not, at the time or very shortly after the time that you observed this meeting that you made a report of it to the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

Mr. WEREB. I made a report that evening and the following day; that is, the following evening, after the meeting was over, because I had too many names and it seemed like everyone was taking notes. I took notes and I managed to identify a lot of people as they stood and identified themselves to speak and as to their union affiliation, their positions in the union. I could not help but feel that that was an important step toward protection of the proper union people, people with good, respectable standings in their unions. It alarmed me to this extent: that I believe labor was slandered, having people like that at any command or leadership post, but that was the party's program and policy.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you record the names of the persons present that you could identify?

Mr. WEREB. I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. As members of the Communist Party?

Mr. WEREB. I did, sir. Did you wish to hear them now?

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me ask you this first: Do they include in some instances the names of the members of the Hawthorne Club that you have already given us?

Mr. WEREB. I believe there are about four names in there in that group. There were, I believe, four delegates to this convention.

Mr. TAVENNER. With the exception of a very small number, these are persons not already identified by you?

Mr. WEREB. That is correct, and these are all functionaries of the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well. I would like for to proceed. Again, if you can give any identifying information in addition to the name itself, I wish you would do it.

Mr. WEREB. I will try.

The first person was William Schneiderman, Smith case.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you say "Smith case," you are speaking of one of the defendants in the Smith trial?

Mr. WEREB. Yes; who was convicted of the Smith Act.

Alice Ward Sparks: The assistant manager, business manager, of the People's World in Los Angeles.

Bud Blair, B-l-a-i-r: This man was the chairman of the South Side or industrial section.

Emil Freed, F-r-e-e-d, who was convicted in the Los Angeles courts for inciting a riot at some strike line or other, and he served a little time.

Harold Roberts: An employee of the Peoples World.

Mr. TAVENNER. May I interrupt you a moment. Do you know whether Emil Freed was at one time a candidate for the United States Senate on the Communist ticket?

Mr. WEREB. I do not recall.

Helen Norfjor, N-o-r-f-j-o-r: A printer's helper.

John Stapp, active in the moving picture unions. I do not know which one, in the moving picture industry.

Mr. TAVENNER. These, I understand, were functionaries.

Mr. WEREB. Yes, sir; functionaries. These were all people who were delegated with these credentials and these credential cards, because as the cards were turned in I copied the names.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee has had considerable evidence regarding John Stapp and his activities as a functionary.

Mr. WEREB. Beebe Goldstein, an employee of a trucking concern.

Mr. TAVENNER. Spell Goldstein.

Mr. WEREB. G-o-l-d-s-t-e-i-n.

Mr. TAVENNER. And spell all of the names after this.

Mr. WEREB. I am sorry.

Miriam Brooks, M-i-r-i-a-m B-r-o-o-k-s. So far as I knew, that was correct.

We have a repetition here; Dan McComb.

Mr. TAVENNER. Whom you have already identified.

Mr. WEREB. I have already identified him in the Hawthorne group.

Edith Smith: I have already identified her in the Hawthorne group.

Dave Chriss, who at that time was heading the El Segundo-Redondo group. They had split.

Jean Chriss: I have already identified her as the relative of Dave Chriss.

Wilhelmina Maise, M-a-i-s-e: She is the one that signed me up to the Communist Party and was chairman of the West Lake group.

Elizabeth Glenn—also knew her as Elizabeth Leich Glenn.

Adele Young, a housewife, I believe, and active around the bookstore quite a bit, Progressive Book Shop.

Lou Baron, active in a builder's union; also I believe for awhile on the county committee, B-a-r-o-n.

Mike Gorman: also identified this person before.

Chester Fein, F-e-i-n: I also identified him in the Hawthorne group.

Bea or Beatrice Baron, B-a-r-o-n, a fulltime employee of the Los Angeles County Communist Party collecting dues from dues secretaries.

Bill O'Neil: I believe he was an aircraft worker, O'-N-e-i-l, of a group on the west side somewhere.

Frank Whitley, W-h-i-t-l-e-y: Whitley was the chairman, I believe, of the Adams Communist Party group.

Ann Trojan, T-r-o-j-a-n, very active in the Rhetta group.

Mr. TAVENNER. What group?

Mr. WEREB. Rhetta Club of the Communist Party; R-h-e-t-t-a, I believe. The Rhetta group.

Louise McCord, M-c-C-o-r-d: I believe she was one of the delegates in a number of functions from a different group, but I cannot recall which one.

Nemmy Sparks: This man was the chairman of the Los Angeles County Communist Party at 124 West Sixth Street for a period of a year and a half or more. N-e-m-m-y. This was an alias, and I never did find out what his real name was.

Dorothy Healy, H-e-a-l-y: She succeeded Max Silver in his position as the party executive secretary.

Mr. DOYLE. When was Max Silver deposed or when did he get out? What happened?

Mr. WEREB. Right after the Duclos letter he was disposed of.

Mr. DOYLE. Just like Browder?

Mr. WEREB. Yes, evicted; could not serve the purpose of the revolutionary group. Was of no use to the party.

Mr. DOYLE. I read the Duclos letter some years ago, and as I recall the appraisal I made of it, it was the same as you have. The Communist papers disagreed with Browder's belief that the Communist policy would fit in and keep economic peace with the capitalistic philosophy of our Nation, and the Soviet Communist Party through Duclos, the Frenchman as you say, wrote this letter to this country showing it could not be; that there must be the survival of one economic philosophy or the other, Soviet communism or our own capitalist people. Some people favor the Soviet Communist philosophy.

Mr. WEREB. At one time I was appointed temporary educational director. A full-time Communist employee of the party by the name of George Sandy instructed me as to how to conduct an educational, which is most important of any Communist meeting. He said, "Well, you know during this Browder period"—there was no Duclos letter in sight at that time, but he said during this Browder period, "Tell them anything, what is the difference? It is not going to stay put anyway; they won't know the difference. When the right time comes the party will become"—it was way over my head; I didn't know what he was talking about.

I talked of some of the writings of Browder at that time. He thought at the end of the meeting I had done a fairly good job, but it was of no consequence, meant nothing; and the party was aware this was only temporary, just one sidestep before stepping forward.

Mr. DOYLE. What was the sidestep?

Mr. WEREB. This cooperative period of Browder. It was in my mind—to the best of my judgment, sir, it was nothing but a sham until the war was over, that they could get all they possibly could from this country and then they would turn and become the same old revolutionary brigands they have ever been.

Mr. SCHERER. I wonder if we can apply a little of that philosophy to the present world situation.

Mr. WEREB. They took a step back this time, sir. Marxist philosophy is you can't always march forward; sometimes take a step side-wise, retreat 1 step to gain 4 steps. As far as I am concerned, this smiling and wearing of the 10-gallon hat in my estimation is a lot of hokum: something to make a lot of good, honest, decent thinking Americans sleep and think, well, manana is here and we are all all right now; he is fine. That is my personal opinion.

Mr. SCHERER. The reason I asked the question, I wondered if we can draw any conclusions from what you said——

Mr. WEREB. I hoped you would.

Mr. SCHERER. With present-day conditions.

Mr. WEREB. I had hoped you would, Congressman.

Next was Merle Brodsky, M-e-r-l-e B-r-o-d-s-k-y, active in one of the east side groups and also a delegate from one of the east side groups.

Elmer Averbuck, A-v-e-r-b-u-c-k, a stuttering, tall fellow, active also in the Hollywood group.

Now comes Shevy Wallace, at one time member of the Rhett group, and then finally a full-time employee of the county Communist Party. (At this point Representative Jackson entered the hearing room.)

Mr. WEREB. Trudy Siminov, T-r-u-d-y S-i-m-i-n-o-v. She was an employee, I believe, of the Yugoslav Relief Committee, the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, and then she worked for the county part time. She was also a delegate to all the county functions and the functionaries meetings.

Barbara Morley, M-o-r-l-e-y, full-time paid employee of the Los Angeles County Communist Party.

Frances Stapp, S-t-a-p-p, of the Hollywood group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that a man or woman?

Mr. WEREB. That is a woman. F-r-a-n-c-e-s.

Pettis Perry, a man who headed the colored commission, very active at the CIO hall most of the time.

Delphine Smith, D-e-l-p-h-i-n-e Smith. She was very active in the Long Beach and Wilmington area and San Pedro area. I think she worked in the shipyards for a while.

Frances Lynn. I knew her just as a delegate.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that individual a man or woman?

Mr. WEREB. Woman; L-y-n-n. It might be L-y-n, but we used the name Lynn most of the time for her in our reports.

Ola Pacifico, O-l-a P-a-c-i-f-i-c-o, the employee of the county who was discharged from the health department because she would not sign the non-Communist oath.

Sally Chriss, previously mentioned as a member of the Redondo group.

Frank Spector, S-p-e-c-t-o-r, an oldtimer; made the papers a lot of times.

Ken Ostreimer, O-s-t-r-e-i-m-e-r, male.

Ben Richman. This Ben Richman was also one of the proponents and instigators from the group around the—I cannot recall that area right now, near the West Lake group in the American Veterans' Committee. He was active at putting on parties at his home for the benefit of the Communist Party and the Peoples World.

Al Richmond, R-i-c-h-m-o-n-d. He is a Smith Act conviction from the Peoples World.

George Sandy, the man I have previously mentioned as a full-time employee or organizer for the Los Angeles County Communist Party.

Ester Miller Sazer, illegal entry into the country from Canada, the best I can remember. She went by two names: Miller and Sazer both.

Mr. MOULDER. Can you further identify the people by the name of Richmond?

Mr. WEREB. Which Richmond, Al or Ben?

Mr. MOULDER. There was a Richman.

Mr. WEREB. Richman was the man that was active in the AVC movement; Richmond was the editor of the Peoples World in San Francisco.

Mr. MOULDER. What was his full name?

Mr. WEREB. Al.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you know where he lived?

Mr. WEREB. He lived in San Francisco. He was convicted under the Smith Act.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe Sazer was the last.

Mr. WEREB. That is the illegal entry into the county, the Sazer woman.

Judy Schmidt, S-c-h-m-i-d-t, for a time full-time employee of the Peoples World.

Al Sherman, S-h-e-r-m-a-n, Hollywood group.

Miriam Brook Sherman, wife, very active and constant delegate. According to one of her speeches, she was given a trip to Russia to see Stalin because she recruited more members into the Communist Party than anyone in the Los Angeles County, so her reward was a trip to see Stalin.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you know whether she got to see him or not?

Mr. WEREB. She stated that she did. It was only through her story and what she repeated to the functionaries group is where I got my information.

Mr. DOYLE. Where did she make that statement?

Mr. WEREB. She made that at 2200 East Seventh Street sometime in August of 1945.

Mr. SCHERER. Was she impressed?

Mr. WEREB. I guess she was. She was rather a big figure in the Hollywood Communist group. She was very influential.

Walter Smith, male; in the San Pedro area.

(At this point, Representative Moulder left the hearing room.)

Mr. WEREB. Jane Sniffen, S-n-i-f-f-e-n. This is a woman who belonged to a group, but I could not tell you what group she belonged to. I had seen her a number of times at functionaries meetings, but it seemed like I always tried to find out who somebody else was. I had her pegged already, so it was all right.

Loretta Stack of San Francisco, I believe, and she was also known as Starvus. She is the woman that got up at this meeting I have reference to and stated that the workers of the United States would be the gravediggers of the capitalist government of this country. Also received quite an ovation.

Mr. DOYLE. Where was that?

Mr. WEREB. At 2200 West Seventh Street, the second section of the California Communist convention. I believe it was in August of 1945.

Mr. DOYLE. Will you make it clear to me how high up the ladder of Communist functionaries she was?

Mr. WEREB. She was one of the State committee members.

Mr. DOYLE. State of California?

Mr. WEREB. That is right, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. Was there any way, Witness, of you knowing whether these people who made these statements did so with conviction and sincerity, or were they merely going through a ritual?

Mr. WEREB. At a Communist Party functionary meeting, sir, you only say the policy of the party. You do not repeat any irresponsible self-thought or self-induced speeches or ideas. You repeat only the party policy, especially when you are holding a position as high as she has held.

Mr. SCHERER. That is what I meant, whether it was merely a ritual or repetition of party policy, or whether these people actually were convinced. Of course, it is difficult for you to look into somebody's mind, I know that; but from your wide experience and acquaintance with these individuals, I was wondering whether or not you came to any conclusions as to whether they were actually revolutionaries at heart or whether they were merely repeating a ritual or policy of the party in line with what was expected of them.

Mr. WEREB. Might I explain this way: She was also 1 of the 14 convicted in Federal courts in this country, in this State, under the Smith Act.

Mr. SCHERER. That certainly answers my question as to her.

Mr. WEREB. Anna Tenoyucca, T-e-n-o-y-u-c-c-a. I believe she was one of the Spanish or Mexican descent delegates, or of the Mexican group—I am not too sure.

Harry Bennett, B-e-n-n-e-t-t, of the Terrace Communist group. That is an East Side group.

His wife, Sophia, S-o-p-h-i-a, Bennett.

Charlotte, C-h-a-r-l-o-t-t-e, Benoitte, B-e-n-o-i-t-t-e—just known as a delegate, did not have too much time with her.

Mrs. Bud Blair, this is the wife of the chairman of the industrial section of the South Side section of the Communist Party.

Carl Brant, B-r-a-n-t. He was labor chairman of the Los Angeles County labor group; also chairman of this meeting.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee endeavored to subpoena Mr. Brant for this hearing but was unable to serve the subpoena. Do you have any other information about his activities in the Communist Party?

Mr. WEREB. I do, sir. And this is where I believe that the honorable Congressmen would be very much interested as to the violence put into practice by the Communist Party.

Mr. SCHERER. May I interrupt, Mr. Chairman? This witness certainly has been on the stand a long time and must be tired. Is there not some way we could give him a little recess and call some other witness in the meantime and then bring him back? He has been on the stand a couple of hours before lunch and now also another hour.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I would like for him to proceed a little further, if you do not mind. Will you tell us about Carl Brant?

Mr. WEREB. In the fall—rather, the early part of the winter of 1946, I believe it was near Christmas, we were given instruction by the chairmen of our groups to attend a meeting held at the Templar Hall, which is located just west of Jefferson, west of Vermont Avenue on Jefferson Boulevard. The meeting ordinarily for a functionary group, has always been designated—it is designated as to its nature, whether a Peoples World drive, membership drive, or whatever drive this is. This was nameless. Only the South Side section, including the San Pedro area, the Long Beach area, Wilmington, was called to this meeting.

The meeting was chaired by Bud Blair, the section chairman. He started off by reading off some Peoples World drives, which were absolutely impertinent to what we were called for. A few minutes after we started speaking of the Peoples World progress, a man walked in whom I knew to be a Communist for a long time, Carl Brant. He was also the head of a union that was on strike at that time at the United States Motors located near Slausson and Avalon Boulevards, I believe two blocks west.

Bud Blair introduced Carl Brant to the group; that Carl Brant would have something very serious to say to this group. Everyone sat back and listened. He said, "Comrades"——

Mr. TAVENNER. Who said this?

Mr. WEREB. Carl Brant. He now was addressing this meeting. He said, "Comrades, there has been by the superior court in the county of Los Angeles an order issued limiting the pickets. This is unfair, a screwy decision, and we are not going to stand by and take it. Therefore tomorrow morning each and every one of you recruit, bring out all the husky manpower you possibly can because we are going to boot the hell out of the Los Angeles police and we are going to break that order."

Mr. SCHERER. I wonder what becomes of all of the assertions and statements that we hear before this committee by certain witnesses; namely, that we should leave these matters up to the courts and that they will abide by the decisions of the courts, and they are not interested in the conclusions of this committee. It seems that when they get into court the same reasoning applies to court decisions and the attitudes of courts as it does to the activities of this committee. I just wanted to make that observation.

Mr. WEREB. He said, "This is the time for Communist action. You have mobilized, you have learned to mobilize. Now we are going to put mobilization into force."

Mr. DOYLE. How many men were there?

Mr. WEREB. The following morning, sir, I went out, being Peoples World director.

Mr. DOYLE. How many were at this meeting?

Mr. WEREB. I would say 30 people.

Mr. DOYLE. Any women?

Mr. WEREB. Yes, there were, because there were functionaries, women functionaries in the group; women can recruit and mobilize as well as men can, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. This incident which he is relating demonstrates to me clearly the value of having informants within that group because I am sure that before he had concluded the police department and the Federal Bureau of Investigation knew the intention of that group to mobilize against the police.

Mr. DOYLE. In any sense, was this a Communist closed meeting or union?

Mr. WEREB. This was a Communist functionary meeting of the South Side industrial section; there was no one else but Communists there. I believe Alice Ward, Nemmy Spark's wife, was one. I believe Elsie Mancar, secretary of the Mine, Mill and Smelters Workers Union, was present. There were a number of other people. At the present time I am too much occupied in my mind to relate who were there.

Mr. DOYLE. In other words, here was a bunch of 35 or 40 Communists planning to do something on the picket line.

Mr. WEREB. The idea, sir, was we were going to break the police line.

Mr. SCHERER. Violate the order of the court.

Mr. DOYLE. Violate the order of the court and bring reputable organized labor into disrepute.

Mr. WEREB. The following morning I was on the picket line with the manpower we mobilized. The police department had a hundred or more policemen out there in the morning, and at 7 o'clock the parade started. In spite of the police loudspeaker warnings, the parade started down Lawson Avenue going west; I would say 1,500 people. This was led by 2 people. They spearheaded this. One was Philip Connelly. This Philip Connelly was convicted of the Smith Act in this trial in Los Angeles, and this man Carl Brant. They came at the head of this and defied the police, defied all of the people—all its law-makers—and they were going to have violence, and they did have violence. There were a number of heads broken, tear gas. There was fighting, there was general rioting.

Mr. JACKSON. The usual police brutality, isn't that the expression? That is how it was reported in the paper, Cossacks attack the innocent workers and violence—

Mr. WEREB. I took refuge in the railroad yards, over the back fence. I am not young, but I made it. I wanted no tear gas or police.

Mr. SCHERER. How many joined the picket line?

Mr. WEREB. I would say 1,500; I do not say all Commies.

Mr. SCHERER. Three hundred less than picketed us last month in Newark.

Mr. WEREB. That demonstrated to me violence and bloodshed as taught by Marxism and Leninism. It was a method of carrying out defiance of legal authority.

Mr. DOYLE. In other words, here were two known Communists leading a group of American working men and women, most of whom probably had no idea that the Communist Party was leading them down the road.

Mr. WEREB. That is correct.

Mr. DOYLE. Again bringing reputable labor in my State in disrepute.

Mr. WEREB. That is right. This was just one of the instances of bringing out mobilization, bringing out force, bringing out violence—because I could not describe it better, I could not conscientiously in my own mind justify it any other way but an actual revolutionary step. I can be told by authorities not to do so, and the reason I am told that is because a law was enacted by the greatest majority of the people through the representatives for that, and when I defy that I know I am doing the wrong thing. And they knew, because the police came with loudspeakers and warned them that they are acting against the orders of the court and that if they dispersed there would be no trouble. But instead of dispersing, these two men led this group—and most naturally, most of the front people were Communists.

Mr. SCHERER. Instead of following the procedures prescribed by the Constitution which they pretend to defend in these hearings and appealing the decision of that court through the procedures prescribed, they took the law into their own hands and violated the order of the court.

Mr. WEREB. This was one of the instances, sir.

I would appreciate about a 10 minute recess.

Mr. TAVENNER. May I ask you one question first. The Philip Connelly you referred to as being one of the two leaders of this group, do you recall whether or not he served a jail sentence on the charge of inciting a riot?

Mr. WEREB. Yes, he did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Relating to this very matter?

Mr. WEREB. Yes, he did, sir. There were about 15 people of the leadership of that group who served sentences, but I stayed out of that mostly because I did not want to get involved. There was a chance for me to be uncovered, so I stepped back and stayed away. There were chances there of being uncovered, and I could not take that.

Mr. DOYLE. The committee will stand in recess 5 minutes.

(Whereupon, a short recess was taken.)

Mr. DOYLE. Come to order.

Let the record show that a legal quorum of the subcommittee is here, Mr. Jackson, of California; Mr. Scherer, of Ohio; and Mr. Doyle, of California.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Wereb, you were answering a few questions I had asked you regarding Carl Brandt. Will you proceed now with giving of the names of the functionaries of the Communist Party who attended the meeting regarding the Duclos letter?

Mr. WEREB. We had one Archie Brown, who at one time ran for Governor of the State of California on the Communist Party ticket. Rose Chernin, convicted in the Smith Act. Philip Connelly, convicted in the Smith Act. Ben Dobbs, convicted, Smith Act. Dr. Hy Engelberg. This next name I am going to omit because this woman was not at that meeting. That was Elizabeth Gurley Flynn. She was at another meeting.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, you do not place her at that meeting?

Mr. WEREB. Not at that particular meeting. She was at another meeting and somehow this name got into this wrong place. She was one of the national committeemen, I think, of the Communist Party of the United States.

Jim Forrest—he was the chairman and organizer in the Long Beach area of the Communist Party. Leon Ginsberg, functionary from the west side. Shirley Gray, functionary, I don't recall from what club at this time. Henry Steinberg, convicted in the Smith Act. Jane Swanhauser. She is of the Hollywood group, I believe, a functionary, and very active in the People's World drive. She was very active in membership committee drives.

James Talley, a functionary of the Central Avenue section. Frank Kadish, member of the county committee of the Los Angeles party. Pat Kiloran. Pat Kiloran I believe was also a reporter for the People's World.

Eva Korn—she assisted very often besides her functionary work, she assisted at the county offices with literature work, mimeographing, mailing, and whatnot.

Rudy Lambert, convicted, Smith case. Ring Lardner, Jr., was supposed to have been at the first section, not the second section I am speaking of now. He should have been mentioned as present at the first section at the Danish Hall. Albert Lima, convicted, Smith Act. George Lohr, representing, I believe, the San Diego area.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, that is the same individual that we learned during the San Diego hearings was in Czechoslovakia. He is in Czechoslovakia now.

All right, go ahead.

Mr. WEREB. Jack Moss. I omitted two names until later for other purposes. Those two were not present at that meeting.

Fletcher Nester, father-in-law or father of Dorothy Healey, convicted under the Smith Act, not Fletcher Nester but Dorothy Healey was. Sophie Nester. These are the names.

There are more names I have but these are names of those people who were at the southern section of the California Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have been asking you what functionary meetings of the Communist Party you attended and this one in which you have named all these functionaries was one of them.

Were there any other functionary meetings that you attended?

Mr. WEREB. Yes; there were, sir. I recall one functionary meeting in the early part of 1947. At this meeting, there were 2 within 3 weeks, large functionary meetings that were held at 2200 East Seventh Street. I think it was known as the Park Manor. There at the first meeting William Schneiderman instructed all functionaries due to the trouble he is having with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the police department, and other stool-pigeon agencies as he called them, he no longer wants any contact with party members by mail, telephone; the correct names are no longer necessary to be used.

If you have any new member or a recruit as they would call them you are to take them to places of integration personally and see that they were integrated into their Marxist classes or into the groups to which they will be assigned, be it labor, be it language, or be it arts or whatever group that they had work in.

He seemed very, very much dissatisfied with the treatment the American people were giving the Communist Party and he urged that there would be a doublecheck on all members, there would be a security check on everybody and that this check would include a very severe Marxist program and this Marxist program would include all labor leaders and those who are active in their union to be given special Marxist training and that no longer——

Mr. SCHERER. Just a minute.

Mr. WEREB. May I finish the sentence?

Mr. SCHERER. To keep the record straight, when you said give these instructions to all leaders in labor unions, you mean leaders who were already members of the Communist Party?

Mr. WEREB. That is right. You broke my thought there.

Mr. SCHERER. It sounded too bad on the record.

Mr. WEREB. He said that labor union men who might think that their position in the party as Communists would jeopardize their position in the union, they no longer would have to be known as Communists. That was the sum and substance of the security meeting of that group.

Mr. SCHERER. You mean they wouldn't have to disclose their identity, those groups would go underground?

Mr. WEREB. Especially in labor movement or labor leadership.

Mr. SCHERER. You said this was a rather rigid security check?

Mr. WEREB. Yes, it was. The order was to conduct a rigid security check.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you given your security check following that meeting?

Mr. WEREB. Very shortly. I want no more.

Mr. SCHERER. Were members dismissed as a result of that security check?

Mr. WEREB. They would be tried by a security group or security body and then if the party found that they were antagonistic to the party or they were not loyal or were not willing to go down the full line of the party, they would be tried in absentia or within their presence, didn't make a bit of difference, and they would be listed by the party as enemies of labor, stool pigeons of capitalism and they would tag them, they would manage to hang a tag or some type on them whereby that individual was no longer accepted by capital or by labor.

Mr. TAVENNER. The party felt for its own safety and security it had to expel those from its list those who were not loyal to the party?

Mr. WEREB. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am wondering today when the United States Government is doing the same thing, expelling from its employ persons who it feels are security risks, why there is such a hue and cry about that type of check by this same group who did the same thing to protect the Communist Party.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask this: I understood you to say that these Communist Party members were tried for security clearance even in their absence.

Mr. WEREB. They were tried—

Mr. DOYLE. You said in absentia.

Mr. WEREB. In other words, they didn't have to be present at the trial.

Mr. DOYLE. They always got notice of the trial, I hope.

Mr. WEREB. Yes; they did, but ordinarily it wasn't very complimentary, they would get it in a roundabout way in such a way as to destroy their standing in the union, in their job.

Mr. DOYLE. Did they get a bill of particulars or complaint?

Mr. WEREB. That was always prewritten, always the same charge, as being an enemy to the masses. That was the general charge and—

Mr. DOYLE. Very indefinite.

Mr. WEREB. They didn't care about any points that were definite. You were just an enemy to the masses of the people and therefore you were expelled or you were tagged or you were eliminated.

There was another class—may I proceed?

There was another class within 3 weeks or so of this security class, which was chaired by Dorothy Healy. Dorothy Healy reminded us of the meeting 3 weeks previous and agreed fully that the worst, that there were spies in the organization, there were disruptions, anything that didn't please them was a disruption. There was opportunism, that is another tag they would hang on somebody, an opportunist, and you were dead.

Of course saying dead would be just as a member. This meeting, she proposed another group, some of them of this first bunch that were present and then I have other names that were present at this other class or group for instruction and she told the functionaries not to use the mail, not to contact by phone, but all strikes are to be Communist led and they are to be controlled by the Communist Party.

The progress of the strike was to be reported to the county board from time to time as to its progress or no progress. She urged that there would be mass meetings of disruption of proceedings, disorderly conduct, and what-not, at shop gates, open Communist meetings or progressive meetings, shall we say, on street corners, that Congressmen were to be picketed at their homes in case they enacted legislation contrary to the welfare of the party.

Mr. DOYLE. The Communist Party?

Mr. WEREB. That is right. Would you mind if I refresh my mind on that meeting? I have a note or two here which I would like to bring out. I hate to delay. She also urged that every one would be doubly checked again for Marxist and Leninist training. She demanded the reinstitution of all Leninist programs. A Leninist program was the means of carrying out revolution. It wasn't Marxist so much, it was the Leninist program she was driving at.

Mr. DOYLE. What woman was that?

Mr. WEREB. Dorothy Healy, the head of the Los Angeles County Communist Party.

Mr. DOYLE. Where is she today?

Mr. WEREB. She has been convicted under the Smith Act, the trial here 2 years ago. All recruiting must be very careful as to who they recruit. There should be a concentration on labor leaders and these labor leaders are to have their training quietly and according to the set rules of the party.

Mr. DOYLE. Why do they try to get top labor leaders in to the Communist conspiracy? They seem to put more effort on that than any other group.

Mr. WEREB. I believe the best way I can explain that, sir, is that labor everywhere in the world I believe at one time or other has had some uneasy experiences and if you want to talk to a man, I will give you a for instance here, if you want to talk to a man about a traffic cop, all you have to do is talk to a fellow who already has a ticket and you have got a sour apple. There were some people at one time or other that had been discharged from their jobs or they had been laid off from their work, and they didn't have the best of everything we have.

Most naturally they were easiest to prey on. They would do things for their own welfare and not know what they were doing because the Communist Party didn't go after membership in large numbers. Their power was not in numbers. Their power was in a close-knit well organized group whereby in leadership, in government, everywhere else—she also said at this meeting that the industries to concentrate on would be aviation, shipping, transportation, communications, I believe she covered those pretty darn well, all basic industries.

Mr. DOYLE. In other words, the industries that the Communist conspiracy would want to weaken or destroy or handicap in the event we were attacked by a foreign enemy.

Mr. WEREB. It would be necessary that they control that.

Mr. DOYLE. I think some of these young people, and the older people in this room, ought to hear this witness with their ears open pretty wide.

Mr. SCHERER. I think it should be pointed out that this testimony of this witness here isn't isolated testimony. We have heard this story

from witnesses from one end of this country to the other, same type of testimony.

Mr. DOYLE. That is right.

Mr. SCHERER. I wouldn't want some people who are hearing it for the first time to think this is something new.

Mr. TAVENNER. At this point will you give us the names of individuals who attended either of these two meetings which you said were held 1 or 2 weeks apart or additional functionary meetings; then possibly at a later time we will come back to a further discussion of what took place at these meetings.

Mr. WEREB. I would say further, sir, that there was a person by the name of "H." that is the only initial I have, Tilles.

Mr. TAVENNER. What about her?

Mr. WEREB. She was a functionary of the Communist Party from some district which I wasn't aware of at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. What meeting was it?

Mr. WEREB. This is the second meeting I have reference to now, second meeting of the security meeting which was chaired by Dorothy Healy, not the one chaired by Schneiderman.

E. C. Twine, this man was from the Central Avenue District and he has had a prison record once or twice, I believe.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you make it clear for us what meeting this is?

Mr. WEREB. This is that second meeting, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. 1947.

Mr. WEREB. 1947, early part of 1947.

Harry Ultrich, also known as Utrecht, an alias. I knew the man by both names, a functionary delegate from one of the clubs.

Virginia Warren. Anne Pollock. That is the spelling I have, P-o-l-l-o-c-k. Dave Warford, William Weintraub, Dave Warford was active in a labor group somewhere in, whether it was a building trades union I don't recall, but he gave his status at one of the meetings.

William Weintraub, W-e-i-n-t-r-a-u-b. For a while local manager for the People's World, full time employee at that time on Second and Spring Street.

Robert Wilkerson, W-i-l-k-e-r-s-o-n. Charles Gladstone, also known as Charles Young. He was from the Garment Workers group.

Gertrude Staughton, S-t-a-u-g-h-t-o-n. She was from I believe Hollywood, I wouldn't know for sure at this time.

Nathan Shapiro, district manager in the north end of town for People's World and a functionary delegate to most of the meetings.

Anne Bilan, a delegate from one of the group, I don't recall right at the present moment. Irving Goldman, a recent transfer at that time from the Young Communist League who had reached the age where he was too old for the Young Communist League, and it was his turn to take part and take action duty in the Communist Party. He lived within about six blocks of my residence, he and his wife both belonged there.

Don Healy. This man was formerly husband of Dorothy Healy, whom I mentioned as the Smith case. Larue McCormick. She belonged to an east side group, I am not sure if it was the Watts Club or not. She at one time, I believe, ran for city council or something, some little office, didn't amount to anything.

Mr. JACKSON. City council of what?

Mr. WEREB. I believe it was either Watts or that district in there. I am not too sure of that but I know she ran for some office. At one time she ran for the board of education too and she flopped there.

Cliff Houdeck, H-o-u-d-e-c-k, a functionary delegate. Ed Hollingshead. Ed Hollingshead was the watchdog of the party. He would manage to hang about the CIO hall most of the time and find some one who was anti-Communist or didn't exactly like the party and he was there to cause all the trouble and all the headaches at one time. He was known as their security officer at large. They had two, you know. Hershel Alexander, Watts group, very active functionary, also a member of the southwest industrial group.

(Representative Jackson left the hearing room.)

Mr. WEREB. Harden Westman, for a time People's World director and district manager for People's World in Inglewood District. Martha Hard, functionary delegate from one club, I don't recall which club at this time.

Shevey Wallace. This Shevey Wallace is the one I had reference to as a full time employee of the Los Angeles County Communist Party. Those are about all the names that I have for that meeting, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, this witness has been on the stand all day. There are more questions that I would like to ask him but I would prefer to pass it over until tomorrow morning and proceed with other witnesses at this time.

Mr. DOYLE. We begin tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock.

Mr. DOYLE. Is that satisfactory to you, sir?

Mr. WEREB. Very satisfactory.

Mr. DOYLE. You are excused until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning. Thank you.

Mr. WEREB. Thank you, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. James Burford.

Mr. DOYLE. Do you solemnly swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. BURFORD. I do.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you. Be seated, please.

(Representative Jackson returned to the hearing room.)

TESTIMONY OF JAMES BURFORD, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, LEON BRNTON, JR.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state your name, please, sir?

Mr. BURFORD. James Burford.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted that you are accompanied by counsel. Would counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. BRNTON. Leon Brnton, Jr., Los Angeles.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Burford?

Mr. BURFORD. I was born in the United States of America, 1910.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where in the United States?

Mr. BURFORD. California.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you now reside in California?

Mr. BURFORD. I do, sir. A native son.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you resided continuously in California?

Mr. BURFORD. Oh, most of my life.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation?

Mr. BURFORD. Well, Mr. Doyle, this question bears upon some phone calls that I received over a period of the last, well, within the last 4 months telling me that unless I violated, this was the demand, not in these terms, I am not quoting the phone call now—The substance of the phone call was unless I violated—

Mr. SCHERER. Just a minute, Witness. I am addressing the Chair. I ask for regular order. One question is: What is his occupation. He can either tell us his occupation or take the fifth amendment.

Mr. BURFORD. Mr. Doyle, I think this is a very important matter and it has a bearing upon the answer which I am about to give. Now may I answer the question?

Mr. SCHERER. He can give his answer and then explain his answer if he wants to.

Mr. DOYLE. Do the phone calls have anything to do with this committee?

Mr. SCHERER. Not with the committee, but with his occupation.

Mr. BURFORD. It has to do with this committee and with my occupation.

Mr. DOYLE. Let's hear it, Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHERER. I object.

Mr. BURFORD. This phone call threatened me. I would be put out of business and the way of putting me out of business was going to be by calling me before this committee.

Mr. DOYLE. Who called you?

Mr. BURFORD. I don't know. It was an anonymous call like often those things are.

Mr. DOYLE. At what place of business did they call you?

You have made a charge against this committee.

Mr. BURFORD. I was called on my telephone.

Mr. DOYLE. You made a charge against this committee that was pretty serious.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, if the charge has no more substantiation than the unsupported word of the witness that he was called and threatened, it doesn't concern me a great deal.

Mr. BURFORD. For a committee that has taken the kind of unsubstantiated testimony that this has, it is a funny time to start worrying about—

Mr. JACKSON. Give me the unsubstantiated testimony. Which one? What testimony do you have reference to, sir? You have volunteered the statement that we have received unsupported testimony. I want to know what it is. In case there is a refusal to answer, I want a direction, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DOYLE. That is right. Tell us in what case in this hearing we have received testimony that isn't true?

Mr. BURFORD. I read the book of Mr. Harvey Matusow.

Mr. JACKSON. That is not an answer to the question. I don't care about Matusow.

Mr. BURFORD. It is embarrassing to you to hear about Harvey Matusow.

Mr. JACKSON. Let's not get away from the question. There is a question pending. You have made the statement that this committee during these hearings has taken unsupported testimony. I want to know what testimony.

Mr. DOYLE. I direct you to answer.

Mr. JACKSON. I want it on the record.

Mr. BURFORD. I do not have a copy of the record.

Mr. JACKSON. The copy of the record is being made. I want your answer on the record.

Mr. BURFORD. I do not have a copy of the record in front of me.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you have any proof that this committee has received any unsupported testimony as you have just stated voluntarily?

Mr. DOYLE. I direct you to answer. We don't accept the answer you gave.

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. BURFORD. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the committee go back into the record of the testimony of Mr. Harvey Matusow who later said that he had——

Mr. JACKSON. Just a minute. Don't beat around the bush.

Mr. BURFORD. I am not.

Mr. JACKSON. This is evasive. You said this committee has received unsupported testimony.

Mr. BURFORD. Did this committee receive testimony from Harvey Matusow?

Mr. JACKSON. In this hearing?

Mr. BURFORD. I didn't say in this hearing. I said this committee.

Mr. JACKSON. All right. In what regard was the testimony of Mr. Matusow before this committee in error?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. BURFORD. By his own admission.

Mr. JACKSON. No. Every witness who has been called as a result of the Matusow testimony before this committee has taken the fifth amendment.

Mr. BURFORD. That is my answer.

Mr. JACKSON. Of course the answer is entirely evasive. It was your intention to say that witnesses who have appeared here during this hearing——

Mr. BURFORD. Don't tell me my intention. I know what my intention is.

Mr. JACKSON. You say, sir, any testimony which you have heard or has been taken before this hearing during this week is unsupported?

Mr. BURFORD. I have not been here but a short time this week.

Mr. JACKSON. You have been here 2 or 3 days. I have seen you in the corner, which is all right, we are glad to have you here.

Mr. BURFORD. Mr. Doyle, I decline to answer any comment on any testimony of any witness before this hearing in this room.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Doyle, I think the question has been adequately covered.

Mr. DOYLE. I want to ask one more question on this anonymous phone situation that you blurted out as you first took the stand. What did you do? Did you report it to the police? If you didn't, why didn't you?

You didn't, did you?

Mr. BURFORD. No, I did not.

Mr. DOYLE. Of course not.

Mr. JACKSON. Did you report it to the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

Mr. BURFORD. That is your opinion, Mr. Doyle—"of course not."

Mr. JACKSON. You didn't. Did you report it to the Bureau?

Mr. BURFORD. I made a statement that I didn't.

Mr. JACKSON. Why didn't you? Isn't that the act of a law-abiding citizen who is threatened over the telephone? Isn't the logical thing as soon as the caller hangs up to call the police?

Mr. SCHERER. His statement in my opinion is pure fabrication.

Mr. DOYLE. This began 3 weeks ago, according to your words.

Mr. BRONTON. I resent the fact that you sit there and call him a liar and you do that when you say, "pure fabrication." He is here under subpena, not to take insults.

Mr. SCHERER. You know the rules of this committee, Counsel.

Mr. BRONTON. I know them very well.

Mr. SCHERER. If you can't abide by them, I will ask that you be cited for contempt.

Mr. BRONTON. I think it is contemptuous when any Congressman calls a witness a liar.

Mr. JACKSON. Why didn't you call the police? If your occupation was threatened, if your life was threatened, isn't the normal thing for an American citizen to do to notify the authorities rather than maintain the alleged threat inside himself as a basis for a speech when he came up here?

Mr. BURFORD. Mr. Jackson asked me a question?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes.

Mr. BURFORD. When you ask questions and supply the answers at the same time I don't think there is anything further required.

Mr. JACKSON. I haven't supplied any answer. The question still stands. I would like to have the witness tell me why he didn't notify the authorities that he had been threatened.

Mr. BURFORD. Mr. Jackson, I made on oath a statement here as to what happened. I cannot—it is obvious that I cannot prove it. I did not have a tape-recording machine, I do not have anything material to substantiate it. This I would readily say, and readily admit. However, I do say on oath that I received a phone call.

Mr. DOYLE. One or more?

Mr. BURFORD. I received two.

Mr. DOYLE. All the same day, or how far apart?

Mr. BURFORD. They were a matter of several weeks apart.

Mr. DOYLE. When was the first one?

Mr. BURFORD. Exact day I do not remember.

Mr. DOYLE. When was the second one?

Mr. BURFORD. About 3 or 4 weeks after the first.

Mr. DOYLE. Didn't you make any record of the dates or the hour?

Mr. BURFORD. I don't keep a logbook.

Mr. JACKSON. Not when people call to threaten you?

Mr. DOYLE. I would think it would be important as to when people called and threatened you. What phone number did they call you over?

Mr. BURFORD. I decline to answer what phone it was on, Mr. Doyle, because that would be to accomplish it, help to accomplish the purpose that the caller made.

Mr. DOYLE. Didn't you even ask the phone company who called you? Didn't you even ask the operator who called you?

Mr. BURFORD. No operator involved, Mr. Doyle. We have automatic phones in this town.

Mr. DOYLE. Of course. Didn't you even ring the chief operator to find out if she could trace where that phone call came from? I have done that, you know, and I find it is quite helpful. Let's proceed.

Mr. SCHERER. What is your occupation?

Mr. BURFORD. I decline to answer this question under the prerogatives that I have under the Constitution of the United States, a constitution that I have sworn in the past to uphold and to abide by and which I now swear to uphold and to abide by, and which I will in the future.

Mr. DOYLE. Do you plead your constitutional privileges? If so, what amendments?

Mr. BURFORD. Mr. Chairman, I plead the first, the fifth, that amendment which has to do that a person's rights and property will not be taken away from them without due process of law. I don't know the number of it.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question because how could his occupation of Modern Lithographic Press operator incriminate him? I ask that you direct the witness.

Mr. DOYLE. I want the record to show, Mr. Burford, in view of the Supreme Court decision, which is clear to all of us, we are not accepting the answer as you gave it and therefore I instruct you to answer the question.

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. SCHERER. It is obvious he is improperly invoking the fifth amendment and invoking it in bad faith. No basis for invoking the fifth amendment.

Mr. BURFORD. Mr. Doyle, this committee has toppled people before this and the Supreme Court has reversed them and slapped this committee down.

Mr. DOYLE. No. You know we have a Supreme Court decision.

Mr. BURFORD. That is good.

Mr. JACKSON. It is in direct line with the Supreme Court injunctions to the committee that this immediate procedure is being followed. The subcommittee is making it entirely clear on the record that we believe that your occupation is a matter of proper identification and we do not accept your refusal to answer for the reason given as being a proper use of the fifth amendment.

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. DOYLE. We have copies of the full text of the Supreme Court decisions for the use of any witness.

Mr. BURFORD. I have, too, Mr. Doyle.

Mr. JACKSON. I ask that the direction stand.

Mr. BURFORD. Mr. Doyle, in line that this question might tend to imperil my rights under the first and the fifth amendments, I decline to answer.

Mr. SCHERER. Aren't you the owner of the Modern Lithographic Press at 1416 West Seventh Street, Los Angeles, Calif.?

Mr. BURFORD. Mr. Scherer, you are reading that into the record for only one purpose and there isn't anything I can do about it. I am defenseless under this situation. I declined to answer that question for the same reasons that I indicated a moment ago, the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. SCHERER. Is the information we have in our file correct, namely, that you are the owner of the Modern Lithographic Press at 1416 West Seventh Street, Los Angeles, Calif.?

Mr. BURFORD. I decline to answer that question as previously stated.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question.

Mr. DOYLE. I direct that you answer the question. We don't accept your answer as sufficient.

Mr. SCHERER. Before he answers, it is my opinion under the circumstances that if he doesn't answer that question he is clearly in contempt of this committee, and if he invokes the fifth amendment I intend to move at a later date to cite him for contempt. Now he knows how I feel about the matter.

Mr. BURFORD. Mr. Scherer, if for no other reason, my concern for the Constitution of the United States prohibits me from answering this, but also and specifically because any question having to do with the operation of the concern that you mentioned might tend to imperil my rights and privileges under the first and the fifth amendments and I remind this committee again that the Supreme Court has said that the fifth amendment is as much for the innocent, protection of the innocent, as anything else. And by pleading this I in no way stipulate that I have broken any of the laws of the United States.

Mr. SCHERER. Have you refused to tell us whether or not the information we have with reference to your business is correct, because you print at this printing company literature for the Communist Party? Is that the reason?

Mr. BURFORD. I refuse to answer that question for the reasons stated previously.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you engage in any other illegal activity at the Modern Lithographic Press?

Mr. BURFORD. Mr. Scherer, you have rather contradicted yourself, you now ask me if I engage in illegal activity and a moment ago that you were going to cite me for contempt for refusing to answer a question invoking the fifth amendment. There is a contradiction.

Mr. SCHERER. Yes, because when you answered that question you said that I may ask you something about the operation of that company and that gave me an idea. That is the reason I asked you about the operation of this company.

Mr. BURFORD. I want it on the record that I decline to answer on the basis of the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. DOYLE. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Burford, the committee during the course of this hearing has been inquiring into the activities of the Southern California Peace Crusade organization. It has sought to acquire information as to how its affairs are conducted, and by whom they are conducted.

Are you affiliated in any way with the Southern California Peace Crusade?

Mr. BURFORD. I decline to answer any question relative to my affiliation with any organization and for the reasons that I have previously stated.

Mr. JACKSON. I have a question I should like to ask. Are you a member of the chamber of commerce?

Mr. BURFORD. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I am certainly not satisfied with that answer.

Mr. DOYLE. I direct you to answer.

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. BURFORD. Would you repeat the question, please?

Mr. JACKSON. Are you a member of the chamber of commerce?

Mr. BURFORD. No.

Mr. JACKSON. Thank you.

Mr. TAVENNER. Has the Southern California Peace Crusade employed you in any respect in carrying out any of its functions?

Mr. BURFORD. I decline to answer for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with any of the officials of that organization?

Mr. BURFORD. I decline to answer for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether or not Sue Lawson was secretary of this organization in May 1955?

Mr. BURFORD. I decline to answer for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did the Southern California Peace Crusade through Sue Lawson as one of its officers draw and deliver a check bearing date of May 9, 1955, payable to Jim Burford in the amount of \$45, and if so will you tell us the purpose?

I hand you a photostatic copy of the check for your examination.

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. BURFORD. Mr. Chairman, this question directly relates to the freedom of the press and the question of—well, that directly relates to the question of the freedom of the press. I decline to answer for that reason, but I also decline to answer under my rights under the first and the fifth.

Mr. DOYLE. Do you publish a newspaper? I didn't know freedom of the press applied to a commercial printer.

Mr. BURFORD. You didn't, Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. Not the kind of shop you have.

Mr. SCHERER. May I make a statement, Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. I think I have to admit I made a mistake, I think the witness properly invoked the fifth amendment when he refused to answer the question as to his occupation, because it becomes now apparent that there was something about that occupation that might tend to incriminate him if he told us in the beginning, and therefore I acknowledge that I made a mistake and I think he properly invoked the fifth amendment.

Mr. BURFORD. I was going to say there is an interesting piece of history relating to this, at one time people advocated freedom of the slaves that couldn't get things printed because of the kind of community pressure and even the pressure of the law applied against them.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me explain to you the reason for asking these questions.

The committee wants to find out what type of literature was published by the Southern California Peace Crusade, and if you printed it for them you would be in a position to advise the committee as to those facts. That is the purpose for my inquiring from you about these matters.

Mr. BURFORD. Well, if I were in your position and wanted to find out what any particular organization printed, I would simply go and get the copies of what had been printed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Of course what you would do is subpoena the officials of the company who disbursed the information, but if they take the fifth amendment, you must proceed by some other course and that is why I am proceeding through the person who may have printed it.

Mr. BURFORD. I decline to answer the question because of my rights under the first and the fifth amendments.

Mr. TAVENNER. Isn't it true that you keep sample copies of the materials you printed for the Southern California Peace Crusade?

Mr. BURFORD. I decline to answer that for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer the check in evidence and ask that it be marked "Burford Exhibit 1" for identification only.

Mr. DOYLE. So received and so marked.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a check bearing date of May 17, 1955, payable to the Modern Lithographic Press by the Los Angeles Committee for Protection of the Foreign Born. I will ask you to examine that check and state what it was for.

Mr. BURFORD. I decline to answer any questions concerning this check for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you affiliated with the organization?

Mr. BURFORD. I decline to answer that question for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer the document in evidence and ask that it be marked "Burford Exhibit No. 2" for identification only.

Mr. DOYLE. It will be so received and so marked.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Burford, in the course of the investigation conducted by the committee, it has been ascertained from the issue of the Daily People's World of June 6, 1951, that there was an article published in that paper entitled "Fight Opens and Communist Ruling." In the course of the article it is stated that a demand was made upon President Truman to urge the Supreme Court to grant a rehearing in the case of the 11 national Communist Party leaders and that that action was taken by the Independent Progressive County Club Council. It was stated in the article that it was the first step in the Independent Progressive Party campaign for freedom for the Communist leaders and repeal of the Smith Act under which they were convicted.

Do you recall anything about a meeting of the Independent Progressive Party Council at which those matters were discussed—that is, in June 1951?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. BURFORD. I decline to answer that question on the same ground as I previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Isn't it a fact that the Independent Progressive Party engaged in a campaign in behalf of the 11 Communist leaders who were convicted under the Smith Act in New York?

Mr. BURFORD. Are you stating it as a fact?

Mr. TAVENNER. I am asking you isn't it a fact.

Mr. BURFORD. I decline to answer any such question on the grounds of the first and the fifth amendments.

Mr. TAVENNER. Weren't you a member of the Independent Progressive Party Council in June 1951?

Mr. BURFORD. I decline to answer for the same reasons.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you later in 1952 become a member of the State central committee of the Independent Progressive Party?

Mr. BURFORD. I decline to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. In June of 1951, at the time that the Daily People's World referred to this position of the Independent Progressive Party to which I have referred, were you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BURFORD. I decline to answer that question on the same basis that I stated before.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Max Silver, at one time organizational secretary of the Communist Party for Los Angeles County, and who withdrew shortly after 1945 from the Communist Party, testified before this committee on June 24, 1952. At that time he identified you as having been a member of the Communist Party, and as having been the labor director of the Independent Progressive Party in the State of California.

Is there any error in that statement insofar as the reference to you?

Mr. BURFORD. I decline to answer that question and all similar questions under my privileges of the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you the labor director of the Independent Progressive Party in the State of California?

Mr. BURFORD. I believe that is a similar question.

Mr. TAVENNER. No.

Mr. BURFORD. Well, I decline to answer that one, too, then, under the first and the fifth amendments.

Mr. DOYLE. Do you ask that line of questions in order to supplement our information to the effect that the Communist Party was pretty well initiated and took over control of the IPP in many, many places?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. In other words, it is in line with Public Law 601 to find out the extent of subversive activities, whether Communist Party or otherwise, and our information is the Communist Party in California generally took over membership and control of the IPP in certain places and certain times. I ought to make that statement to you so you understand why we are asking those questions.

Mr. BURFORD. I think I understand.

Mr. DOYLE. It isn't a matter of your political belief, but it is a matter of finding out the effort of the Communist Party to infiltrate and control the political parties. That is what it is doing now, trying to crawl into the Democratic Party because the IPP didn't qualify itself as a legal party in California. You Californians ought to wake up and realize what is going on. Both young and old people are crowding into both these bona fide political parties because they don't have the IPP any longer as a legal entity, and therefore the Commies can't control a legal political party because the IPP doesn't exist any longer as a legal party. Therefore, it is now going into both political parties.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Burford, I want to go back and ask preliminary questions which I usually ask and have not asked.

How long have you lived in Los Angeles?

Mr. BURFORD. Well, I have lived here on and off since about 1930, I believe.

Mr. TAVENNER. Since 1930 have you resided in any other place?

Mr. BURFORD. Many places.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you lived in Oakland, Calif., during any part of that time?

Mr. BURFORD. Mr. Chairman, I have to say to that question that to the best of my knowledge and belief I have never lived in Oakland, but for a number of years my occupation was a traveling one and it is very difficult for me, it would be very difficult for me to list all of the places that I lived.

Mr. DOYLE. You would know whether you lived there for any length of time or not, 6 months or a year, you wouldn't forget that.

Mr. BURFORD. Well, I have been in the bay area, but whether I have lived in Oakland I don't remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever used any name other than your own?

Mr. BURFORD. I decline to answer that question under the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. DOYLE. We are satisfied with that answer and I direct you to answer. The United States is entitled to know the people that live within its borders, surely those who have been using some phony name or something of that kind. Congress is entitled to know it.

We are investigating the activities of subversive people and subversive groups who are apt to use secret names and other names—without making any inference as far as you are concerned.

Mr. BURFORD. I understand that. Anything that has to do with the question, this general line of questioning that has been proceeding here, I will decline to answer under the first and fifth amendments. I so decline.

Mr. DOYLE. On what grounds?

Mr. BURFORD. On the grounds I have just stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you used the name Ron Hillyer?

Mr. BURFORD. I decline to answer that question for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BURFORD. I decline to answer that for the same reason that I have declined before.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you at any time been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BURFORD. I decline to answer that question for the same reasons I have stated before.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. I have no questions.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you.

Mr. Burford, you can get your witness fee there if you want it.

Mr. BURFORD. I will donate that to the Red Cross drive, Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. I think that is fine of you. They need it.

(Whereupon the witness was excused.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Anne Pollock.

Mr. DOYLE. Do you solemnly swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

Mrs. POLLOCK. I do.

**TESTIMONY OF MRS. ANNE POLLOCK, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL,
NATHAN L. SCHOICHET**

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please?

Mrs. POLLOCK. Anne Pollock.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted you are accompanied by counsel. Will counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. SCHOICHET. My name is Nathan L. Schoichet, S-c-h-o-i-c-h-e-t. I am an attorney practicing here in Los Angeles, and my office is in Beverly Hills.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a native of California, Mrs. Pollock?

Mrs. POLLOCK. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where were you born?

Mrs. POLLOCK. I was born in Russia.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you come to this country?

Mrs. POLLOCK. In 1906.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a naturalized American citizen?

Mrs. POLLOCK. I am a derivative citizen of my father.

Mr. TAVENNER. When was he naturalized?

Mrs. POLLOCK. In 1922.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you now reside in Los Angeles?

Mrs. POLLOCK. Yes, I do.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you resided in Los Angeles?

Mrs. POLLOCK. Since early 1932.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your profession or occupation, please?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. POLLOCK. I am west coast director of the American Technical Society Technoin.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Pollock, we have been engaged in an investigation of Communist Party activities in the area of Los Angeles. Sworn testimony has been adduced before the committee to the effect that you were assigned by the Communist Party to engage in certain Communist Party activities. Will you tell the committee first, please, when you became a member of the Communist Party, if you did?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. POLLOCK. Do you suggest that any testimony that the committee had before is binding on me?

Mr. TAVENNER. Not at all. My question was to tell us when you became a member of the Communist Party, if you did.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. POLLOCK. Has it been established in the record that I am a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. TAVENNER. There has been evidence here indicating that.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. POLLOCK. I ask is that evidence binding on me?

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you answer the question, please? The answer is not responsive to my question.

Mrs. POLLOCK. I would like to know whether or not testimony given about me is binding on me.

Mr. DOYLE. It depends on whether or not it is the truth, but we are asking you whether or not you were a member of the Communist Party. If you were, when?

Mrs. POLLOCK. That was not the question that I was asked.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I don't understand the question as to whether the evidence given is binding upon her. As a matter of fact, the committee has not necessarily accepted it as evidence or anything else. Basing it upon certain information in the possession of the committee, a question has been asked of you. If it is not true, then certainly this is the forum in which to say so.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mr. JACKSON. What was the question?

Mr. TAVENNER. The question was to state when she first became a member of the Communist Party, if she did become a member. I am not particular about the form of the question. If the witness is puzzled by the question, I will change the question.

Mrs. POLLOCK. I am puzzled because you seem to be assuming a statement of fact. I want to understand your question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me ask the question very pointedly. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party, and if so, when did you join?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mr. JACKSON. I would make it simpler than that and break the question down into two parts.

Mr. TAVENNER. I will change the question again.

Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. POLLOCK. In the context of this inquiry I consider myself in jeopardy and therefore I invoke the first and fifth amendments to the Constitution.

(Representative Moulder returned to the hearing room.)

Mr. SCHERER. Mrs. Pollock, you seem to be concerned as to whether or not the committee has evidence that you are a member of the Communist Party, or whether it has been established before this committee that you are a member of the Communist Party. Mr. Stephen Wereb testified here just a few minutes ago that you were a member of the Communist Party. It would go a long way toward making me make up my mind as to whether his testimony is correct if you answer the question as to whether or not he told the truth, when he said that you were a member of the Communist Party.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mr. DOYLE. I am sure that during the testimony of Mr. Wereb, I saw you seated within a few feet of him, so I assume you heard him name you.

Mrs. POLLOCK. I heard it.

Mr. DOYLE. I was sure you heard it.

Mr. SCHERER. You remember the question, Witness? Did Mr. Stephen Wereb who testified before this committee this afternoon tell the truth when——

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mr. SCHERER. Just a minute. I can see how she can't understand the question if you are talking to her.

Mr. SCHOICET. I am trying to behave here and don't want these comments against me.

Mr. SCHERER. Continue to behave, then.

Mr. DOYLE. Go ahead, Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHERER. My question, Mrs. Pollock, is whether or not Mr. Stephen Wereb who testified before this committee this afternoon tes-

tified correctly when he said that you were a member of the Communist Party.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mr. SCHERER. It is no laughing matter at all. Both counsel and the witness are laughing about the question.

Mrs. POLLOCK. I am perfectly willing to answer questions but I want to make it clear I came here and certainly do not expect to have any kind of pressure. I will do the best that I can. If something strikes me as funny, you know I might even feel I have the right to smile and this too, I think, should be permitted.

Mr. SCHERER. I just want it noted for the record what was happening because the record doesn't show that.

Mrs. POLLOCK. The record does not also show why I smiled, and I don't think it is a fitting thing to place into the record.

Mr. DOYLE. Do you feel now, Mrs. Pollock, you are ready to answer the question?

Mrs. POLLOCK. Yes, sir. Excuse me a minute.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. POLLOCK. Before this committee I do feel myself in jeopardy and I shall invoke the privileges of the first and fifth amendments.

(Representative Jackson left the hearing room.)

Mr. TAVENNER. By that do you mean you refuse to answer the question?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. POLLOCK. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. You invoke the privilege because, I assume, you refuse to answer the question?

Mrs. POLLOCK. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask the witness a question? It is substantially the same question, I grant, but I want to ask it in a little different way: I am not trying to trap you in any way, but I happened to notice you were within a few feet of the witness who testified that he had personal knowledge of the fact that you were a Communist. He had your name listed as you will remember, and read it off with other names.

He made a positive declaration that he knew you as a Communist because he was one even though it was for the FBI, and it is always good, we feel as a committee of Congress, when it happens that a witness on the stand testifies so that the person he names is right in the room at the same time and hears him testify.

Now you have indicated you heard him testify, naming you. I am bringing that to your attention because here is one of the cases where it is possible for a witness to positively deny another witness' testimony. In other words, he was under oath, you are under oath. I want to call to your attention that that is the situation and in other words, it is very fortunate, as we see it, when a witness testifies that John Jones is in the party, and John Jones hears that testimony, and then we call John Jones and say what about it, did the witness tell the truth, or did he lie.

We are giving you an opportunity to tell us whether or not it was true or false what that witness said about you. That is a good opportunity because it doesn't often happen that the person named is in the hearing room at the same time. I just don't know whether your counsel was in the room at the same time and heard that testimony.

Mr. SCHOICHER. I understand.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Pollock, have you ever used the name——

Mr. DOYLE. Wait a minute.

Mr. TAVENNER. Excuse me.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mr. DOYLE. I laid my foundation, Counsel, for the question I want to ask. I want to give you plenty of time and not hurry you. I want you to have every opportunity to confer with your distinguished counsel. Before you confer with him again, I want to ask you now, were you ever a member of the Communist Party?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. POLLOCK. I am going to invoke my privileges under the first and the fifth amendments, Mr. Doyle, and I decline to answer.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you know Stephen Wereb?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. POLLOCK. The same answer. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. SCHERER. So there will be no mistake, did you see the man on the stand who testified here this afternoon who was called by the name of Stephen Wereb. Did you see him on the stand?

Mrs. POLLOCK. Yes, I saw him on the stand.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you know that man by the name of Stephen Wereb or by the name of Weber?

Mrs. POLLOCK. I have already declined to answer that.

Mr. SCHERER. For the same reasons?

Mrs. POLLOCK. For the same reasons.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever used the name Anne Burton?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. POLLOCK. Same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Tashia Freed?

Mrs. POLLOCK. I decline to answer for the same reasons.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you in the hearing room when Tashia Freed testified?

Mrs. POLLOCK. No, I was not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, whether you have ever lived at 6530 Maryland Drive?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. POLLOCK. I will decline to answer that question for the same reasons.

Mr. DOYLE. We can't accept that answer. I direct you to answer the question.

Mrs. POLLOCK. I believe that in the context of this inquiry that I am in jeopardy and that therefore these questions can be refused on the grounds of the first and the fifth amendments.

Mr. SCHERER. You said you believe you are in jeopardy and to pertinent questions invoked you have—and I think properly so—the protection of the fifth amendment, namely, that if you answered the questions you might be in jeopardy and might be prosecuted or might incriminate yourself, so I think you have properly invoked the fifth amendment.

Now what I want to say, Mrs. Pollock, is this: The 83d Congress passed a law which gives this committee the right with the approval of

the Federal court to grant you immunity from any prosecution—that is, that if such immunity is granted, no matter what answers you give, you wouldn't be in jeopardy, the jeopardy which you say you fear. We feel you have quite a substantial bit of information concerning the activities of the Communist Party and which would be very helpful to this committee, and so I am going to ask you now if the committee should invoke that law and grant you immunity so that you wouldn't be in jeopardy no matter what answer you gave or be subject to any kind of prosecution, would you then answer the questions we ask you?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. POLLOCK. I will answer that I decline to speculate on what this committee will do and I stand on my answer.

Mr. SCHERER. The same answer you gave before?

Mrs. POLLOCK. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. You feel to answer my question would tend to incriminate you then?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. POLLOCK. I feel that the answer to this question might involve me in jeopardy and I don't have to answer the question.

Mr. SCHERER. Maybe you misunderstand me. I am merely saying that if this committee with the approval of the Federal court should grant you immunity—that is, should free you from this jeopardy which you say you fear, and there would be no jeopardy, there would be no possibility of any prosecution for any answer that you might give us, if you were freed from that, would you then answer our questions?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. POLLOCK. I think I will make that decision at the time.

Mr. SCHERER. You can see, then, Mrs. Pollock, how there arises in our mind then some question as to perhaps your good faith in invoking the fifth amendment.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. POLLOCK. I am advised by counsel that I have the right to invoke the first and fifth amendments without any implications of this kind.

Mr. SCHERER. You do have the right, but we have the right in view of what I just said to draw our own conclusions, the same as you have.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Pollock, were you a member of the unit J-5 of the Hollywood section of the Communist Party in 1938?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. POLLOCK. I will decline to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you transferred from the unit I mentioned to the 57th assembly branch, section of the Communist Party in 1938?

Mrs. POLLOCK. Same answer on the same grounds.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Tashia Freed the unit membership director of your unit?

Mrs. POLLOCK. I decline to answer that on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to read into the record at this point an exhibit which was introduced by the witness, Mr. William Kimple. He identified this when it was introduced as Exhibit 13 as an original Communist Party document.

It is entitled "Section transfer, transferred from section Hollywood Unit J-5, name, Anne Burton, real name, Anne Pollock, new address 6530 Maryland Drive, dues paid to January 1938, signed Tashia Freed, Unit membership director, assigned to section 57th assembly branch (this card to be given to county membership director)."

Were you issued Communist Party book No. 59962 in the name of Anne Burton?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand this exhibit to you.

Mrs. POLLOCK. I decline to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to introduce a photostatic copy of this Communist Party card in evidence and ask that it be marked "Pollock Exhibit No. 1," for identification only.

Mr. DOYLE. It will be so received and so marked.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have before me a blue card—

Mr. SCHOICHIET. Just a moment. May I confer?

Mr. DOYLE. Go ahead.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Pollock, I have before me a receipt card bearing date of December 7, 1937, for the same Communist Party book—that is, Communist Party book No. 59962. Will you examine it, please, and state whether or not the signature thereon of Anne Burton was made by you?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. POLLOCK. I answer it the same way, Mr. Tavenner, I refuse to answer on the ground of the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to introduce in evidence the photostatic copy of the receipt card and ask that it be marked "Pollock Exhibit No. 2," for identification only.

Mr. DOYLE. It will be so received and marked.

Mr. TAVENNER. It reads as follows:

I have received membership book, Anne Burton, State of California, District 13, County LA., City, L. A., section Union J-5, 12-7-37.

Irrespective of any question of membership on your part in the Communist Party, did you receive any directions, instructions, or suggestions by the Communist Party to engage in Communist Party activities in the Jewish community?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. POLLOCK. On the advice of counsel I refuse to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you engage in any such Communist Party activities?

Mrs. POLLOCK. Same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee has information that there was in existence in Hollywood at least as late as 1950 a secret group within the Communist Party whose identity was endeavored to be kept secret from the rank and file membership of the Communist Party. Do you know anything about the existence of such a secret group?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. POLLOCK. I decline to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you at any time a member of such a group?

Mrs. POLLOCK. Same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Community Party?

Mrs. POLLOCK. Same answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Moulder?

Mr. MOULDER. I have no questions.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. Just one question.

How much money have you contributed to the Communist Party, Mrs. Pollock?

Mrs. POLLOCK. Isn't that just like asking me if I still beat my wife? Isn't that the same kind of category? I beg your pardon. I am sorry.

Mr. SCHERER. I will change it. Have you contributed any funds to the Communist Party?

Mrs. POLLOCK. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. SCHERER. Then what was wrong with my question of how much money have you contributed? The fact is you contributed large sums, have you not, to the Communist Party and Communist Party front organizations?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. POLLOCK. Would you testify to that under oath?

Mr. SCHERER. I am asking.

Mrs. POLLOCK. You are making the statement, you are not asking the question. I have tried to answer questions but I object to statements. There are certain statements I would make but because this is a congressional committee and because of that I have tried hard not to and I find Congressmen making statements for the press or for the record. I don't know—

Mr. SCHERER. You have an opportunity to say if you call it a statement. I said it was a question.

Mrs. POLLOCK. It is not a question.

Mr. SCHERER. If you say it is a statement, we will let it stand as a statement. Is what I said in my statement untrue? You have the right to answer now.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. POLLOCK. If you ask the question I will do my best to answer it.

Mr. SCHERER. I said isn't it a fact—now, you can answer to that question "Yes" or "No"—but isn't it a fact that you have contributed large sums of money to the Communist Party and Communist front organizations?

If that is not a fact, you can say "No"; if it is a fact, you can say "Yes." If you say "Yes" my next question is going to be: How much? But I know what you are going to say. You are going to take the fifth amendment.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. POLLOCK. Thank God I have an attorney. I mean that.

(Representative Jackson returned to the hearing room.)

Mrs. POLLOCK. I am calmer now due to the good offices of my attorney. I think we will both agree for reasons that the first and fifth amendments are in my Constitution—I am not trying to make a speech, I think we agree the reason they are in the Constitution is so I shall not be compelled in any way to furnish any kind of evidence which might tend at any time now or later by any chain to incriminate me. Knowing that I think I have the right and the privilege to claim the amendments which I have and I have so done and do now.

Mr. SCHERER. I think you do have that right and I thought you would.

Mrs. POLLOCK. Well, is that because of personal knowledge of me?

Mr. SCHERER. No; but I have sat in hearings—

Mrs. POLLOCK. By what right do you have the right to say that? I don't think you have any, not until I give an answer.

(The witness conferred with counsel.)

Mrs. POLLOCK. I am sorry. Again thanks to you [addressing her counsel]. Perhaps my work in the community is also—

Mr. SCHOICHIET. There is no question before you.

Mrs. POLLOCK. All right.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you very much. You are excused.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Margaret Vaughn Meyer.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask you to rise and raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. MEYER. I do.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you. Have a chair by your counsel.

TESTIMONY OF MRS. MARGARET VAUGHN MEYER, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, DANIEL G. MARSHALL

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state your name, please.

Mrs. MEYER. My name is Margaret Vaughn Meyer.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted you are accompanied by counsel. Will counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. MARSHALL. Daniel G. Marshall, Los Angeles.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a native of California?

Mrs. MEYER. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. MEYER. I was born in Philadelphia, Pa., United States of America.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell your last name, please?

Mrs. MEYER. M-e-y-e-r.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you move to California?

Mrs. MEYER. To the best of my recollection, I am almost certain that it was the fall of 1937. I can't state positively. I think that was it.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is sufficient. What profession are you engaged in?

Mrs. MEYER. I am a housewife.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you engaged in any profession or trade?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. MEYER. Mr. Doyle, at this time I wish to stand on my rights as an American citizen, democratic rights, which the committee has stated they believe in and I believe in; I have a right to decline. I am going to refuse to answer this question under the protection of the Constitution of the United States, specifically the first amendment to the Constitution, supplemented by the fifth amendment.

Mr. DOYLE. Was your question whether or not she had—

Mr. TAVENNER. What was her occupation, is the substance of it.

Mr. DOYLE. We cannot accept your answer and I direct you to answer the question.

Mr. MARSHALL. This question is somewhat different than the one you proposed and I suggest we read it.

Mr. TAVENNER. I didn't ask the question the second time. The chairman asked what I asked and I advised him the substance of it. If the witness does not understand and wants the question reread we will have it reread. I didn't ask the question over.

To end the matter, will you read the question.

Mr. MARSHALL. We want the question read which the chairman said he was not satisfied with her answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is the only question I asked.

Mr. MARSHALL. The chairman didn't say he wasn't satisfied with the answer to your question. He said he wasn't satisfied with the witness' answer to the chairman's question.

Mr. TAVENNER. No.

Mr. JACKSON. What is the original question? The question asked by counsel.

(The reporter read from his notes as directed.)

Mrs. MEYER. Will you reread the phrasing of it? I am not sure of the phrasing.

Mr. JACKSON. Have you ever engaged in any profession or trade?

Mrs. MEYER. I am now a housewife. I have been a teacher in the past.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you last engage in the profession of teaching?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. MEYER. I believe it was December of 1952 when I last was actually in a classroom.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am sorry, I couldn't hear you.

Mr. MARSHALL. Let the reporter read it.

Mr. DOYLE. December 1952.

Mr. TAVENNER. May I ask the witness to reply to my question, please, as to when it was that she last taught—and I do not like for counsel to prevent her from answering my question.

Mr. DOYLE. She answered it.

Mr. MARSHALL. She answered it. My only suggestion was when you didn't hear to have the reporter read it rather than have her restate it. Let's have the reporter read it if you have any doubt about it.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have a right to ask the witness.

Mr. JACKSON. The witness answered the question in an inaudible manner.

Mr. MARSHALL. Did the reporter hear it?

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you still hold your teaching credentials?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. MEYER. Yes, sir; I do.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you commonly known by the name of Peggy?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. MEYER. I gave you my name, sir, and I refuse to answer questions on the grounds of the first amendment supplemented by the fifth in regard to any other name.

Mr. TAVENNER. May I ask that the witness be directed to answer?

Mr. DOYLE. We cannot accept that answer as sufficient. I direct you to answer the question.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. MEYER. I refuse to answer this question on the grounds of the first amendment of the Constitution, supplemented by the fifth amendment to the Constitution. I believe I have that right.

Mr. JACKSON. No one has questioned your right.

Mr. TAVENNER. You stated that your name is Margaret Vaughn Meyer. How long has your name been Margaret Vaughn Meyer?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. MEYER. I decline to answer this question on the same grounds of my rights under the first amendment supplemented by the fifth amendment.

Mr. DOYLE. We do not accept the answer as sufficient, Mrs. Meyer, and I direct you to answer the question. I think it is a very reasonable question to know who you are and how long you have been known by the name you use.

Mrs. MEYER. I stated my name when first asked, and I refuse to answer any further questions about my name under my rights on the same ground previously stated, the first amendment supplemented by the fifth.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was your name Margaret Vaughn on October 17, 1950?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. MEYER. I decline to answer for the same reasons, on the grounds of the first amendment supplemented by the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a photostatic copy of an oath of allegiance for public employees bearing date 17th day of October 1950, and I will ask you to examine the signature of Margaret Vaughn and state whether or not you signed it or made it.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. MEYER. I decline to answer this question on the same ground as previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer the document in evidence and ask that it be marked "Meyer Exhibit No. 1," for identification only. It is an oath of allegiance for public employees with the signature Margaret Vaughn on it, position title, elementary teacher, subscribed and sworn to on the 17th day of October 1950. On the 17th of October 1950 were you a member of the Communist party?

Mr. DOYLE. It will be received and so marked.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. MEYER. I refuse to discuss anything of this nature in the presence of this committee, it is my right to discuss or not to discuss and so I refuse to answer any such questions so I wish to decline to answer that question on the basis of my rights under the Constitution, the first amendment supplemented by the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Meyer, were you in the hearing room during the testimony of Mr. Stephen Werek?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. MEYER. I do not wish to discuss this. I refuse to answer that question.

Mr. JACKSON. I ask direction. Obviously whether or not she was in the hearing room at the time any other witness testified is in no manner incriminating, and I don't accept the answer and request a direction.

Mr. DOYLE. I don't, either. I direct you to answer the question. It is manifestly pertinent and reasonable.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. MEYER. I believe it is my right to decline to answer this question, which I do on the same grounds as previously stated, the first amendment supplemented by the fifth amendment.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, the answer is still not acceptable so far as I am concerned. I think it is a pertinent question and I ask that the witness again be directed to answer.

Mr. DOYLE. I direct you again, Mrs. Meyer, to answer the question.

Mrs. MEYER. I should like to ask the reason for asking such a question.

Mr. DOYLE. We don't think your answer was sufficient nor competent.

Mrs. MEYER. In what way?

Mr. DOYLE. We are not going to argue about it. You can stand on your rights, whatever your counsel advises you, of course. But I direct you to answer the question so the record will show very clearly what we did.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. MEYER. I refuse to answer that question, sir, I believe that is my right and I am so advised by counsel, on the basis of the protection of the first amendment to the Constitution supplemented by the fifth, which is for the very existence of protecting the rights of the citizens of the United States of America.

Mr. MOULDER. May I say I want to clarify the record. So far as I am concerned, I think this idea of directing a witness to answer the question time after time is a very silly, frivolous procedure. The purpose of that of course is to advise you that in the event you fail to answer you may be cited for contempt.

I think after a witness has once been informed of that fact, there is no reason time after time to say "I direct you to answer."

Mr. TAVENNER. Otherwise, they would contend they didn't understand.

Mr. JACKSON. I think it is necessary in this case on subsequent questions relating to that individual which might conceivably be incriminating where the invocation it seems to me would be perfectly proper. However, as to whether or not a witness was in the hearing room at the time any given individual testified is in my opinion not incriminating, and I want it definitely understood in the record and for that reason I asked for the two directions and I still do not accept it.

Mr. MOULDER. It just makes a silly show of the committee sitting here. As a lawyer I want to make my position clear.

Mr. SCHERER. I have to disagree. I have read the Emspak case and the only reason we do it is because the Supreme Court according to my interpretation of the Emspak case makes us do it. I think it is silly, too. We are bound by it.

Mr. MOULDER. That case held the only purpose it served was to advise the witness they might be cited for contempt. They are advised. There is no reason to direct them time after time.

Mr. JACKSON. I agree the record is clear now.

Mrs. MEYER. Sir, in view of the remarks you have made. I would like to answer the question a little differently, if I may.

I was here today during all of the proceedings.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you hear Mr. Wereb testify that he was known in the Communist Party by the name of Stephen Weber?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. MEYER. I decline to answer questions regarding testimony of any other witness, sir. Mr. Jackson stated that he failed to see anything incriminating in stating whether or not I was here during testimony of another witness, so I decided I would state that I was here today during this testimony of this other witness. However, I feel it is entirely my right to decline to discuss any matter referring to testimony given here. I have that right under the first amendment and fifth amendment of the Constitution and since there is no due process or opportunity to cross-examine witnesses as there would be in a court, I wish to decline to answer the question on those grounds.

Mr. JACKSON. With apologies to my colleague, I am going to enter in the record again the fact that I am not satisfied that one person heard another person say something in the hearing room is incriminating in and of itself, and I am going to ask that the chairman direct the witness to answer.

Mr. MARSHALL. Why don't you have the testimony of that witness read and direct questions to the witness about it instead of asking her if she was here or wasn't here?

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Marshall, please. I direct your witness to answer the question.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mr. SCHERER. While we are waiting for that answer, I might say that the Supreme Court, in the case referred to, says in short, unless the witness is clearly apprised, that the committee demands that answer, notwithstanding his objection, there can be no conviction, under section 192, for refusal to answer the question.

Mr. MARSHALL. Am I supposed to hear part of that, Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. No, that is for the benefit of us who have a little disagreement here.

Mrs. MEYER. The testimony of the witness to whom you refer is a matter of record and I refuse to answer on the grounds of the first amendment, supplemented by the fifth.

Mr. DOYLE. Manifestly we can't accept that as an adequate, proper answer to the question and I direct you to answer. It is an avoidance of a fair question.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. MEYER. Such a question might conceivably tend to incriminate me. Otherwise, I fail to see why it is being asked. I feel that I definitely have the right to refuse to answer the question on the first amendment and supplemented by the fifth.

Mr. DOYLE. You have a right to stand on your constitutional privilege. Do you stand on your constitutional privilege?

Mrs. MEYER. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. Let the record show I consider the question entirely proper and I do not consider the answer to be a proper use of the fifth amendment.

Mr. DOYLE. Neither do I, but I have directed her twice to answer it and that ought to be sufficient for her to understand that we don't accept it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you hear the witness, Mr. Wereb, state that Peggy Vaughn, a teacher, was an active member of the Hawthorne group of the Communist Party?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. MEYER. That is the same type of question and therefore I invoke the protection of the Constitution and decline to answer on the basis of the first amendment supplemented by the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Hawthorne group of the Communist Party?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. MEYER. I refuse to answer any questions of this kind on the basis of the first amendment supplemented by the fifth amendment.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you specifically refuse to answer this question?

Mrs. MEYER. I decline to answer this question on the basis of the first amendment supplemented by the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. MEYER. I decline to answer this question also on the basis of the first amendment, supplemented by the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you knowingly been a member of the Communist Party at any time since September 10, 1948?

Mrs. MEYER. I refuse to answer this question on the basis of the first amendment as well as the fifth amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Jackson?

Mr. JACKSON. No questions.

Mr. MOULDER. No questions.

Mr. SCHERER. No questions.

Mr. DOYLE. I have no questions. Thank you, Mrs. Meyer, and Counsel.

(Whereupon the witness was excused.)

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to make two announcements.

Mr. DOYLE. Will you stand by a moment because it may affect some of you in the room.

Mr. TAVENNER. During the course of the testimony of Mr. Wereb, mention of the name of Mr. John Houston was made. Mr. Houston has indicated a desire to be cooperative with the committee. I thought that it was due him to make that statement now and as an indication he is not a member of the Communist Party at this time. I have reason to believe he will cooperate with the committee in giving such facts as are within his knowledge.

A second matter. It has been called to my attention that there is a Mr. Bert Coffee living in Los Angeles. If that is true, he is not the person referred to by the witness Mr. Wereb. The Bert Coffee referred to by Mr. Wereb lives in the vicinity of San Francisco and I have inquired into it enough to know that it is not the Mr. Bert Coffee who a short time ago was employed in Los Angeles by the FHA.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you, Mr. Tavenner.

The committee will stand in recess until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 5:30 p. m. the committee was recessed, to reconvene at 9 a. m. the following day, Saturday, July 2, 1955.)

INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE LOS ANGELES, CALIF., AREA—Part 4

SATURDAY, JULY 2, 1955

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Los Angeles, California.

PUBLIC HEARING

A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met at 9:10 a. m., pursuant to recess, in room 518 Federal Building, Los Angeles, Calif., Hon. Clyde Doyle (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Clyde Doyle (chairman); Morgan M. Moulder, and Gordon H. Scherer.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, counsel, and William A. Wheeler, investigator.

Mr. DOYLE. Will the committee please convene?

May the record show there is a legal quorum present: Mr. Scherer of Ohio, Mr. Moulder of Missouri, and Mr. Doyle of California acting as chairman.

Are you ready, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir. I would like to recall Mr. Wereb at this time. Mr. Wereb was sworn yesterday.

TESTIMONY OF STEPHEN A. WEREB—Resumed

Mr. Wereb, you described yesterday for us the Communist Party convention at which the Duclos letter episode was discussed. You described for us the attendance at that meeting of the Communist Party functionaries throughout the State of California. You also described for us or told us of statements and arguments that were made on the floor of that convention.

I would like to ask you at this time to go a little more fully into statements made by several of the leading functionaries of the Communist Party in California, Mr. Schneiderman and Mrs. Yates.

Mr. WEREB. To the best of my recollection there was a meeting held at the Embassy Auditorium, I believe in the latter part of 1946, and at this large meeting of functionaries the general speaker or the main speaker was William Schneiderman, who was convicted under the Smith Act at the trial 2 years ago.

Mr. Schneiderman spoke very derogatorily of Mr. Truman, our past president, as to his "A" bomb policy, trying to force on to the world

the threat of the A-bomb which at that time only we possessed. But he also brought to the attention of those present that due to the Socialist and Communist gains in Burma, China, Italy, France, Great Britain, and the rest of the world where Marxism and Leninism now is a serious factor, where could the United States of America in case of a war between the U. S. S. R., appeal for help or allies?

He questioned in his own mind and he put this other question to those present of about 700 at that meeting as to the foreign policy that this country led and conducted.

He demanded that the party through all its agencies and all its forces—forces was the word used most of the time, seemed to be the party pet word—the forces that are capable of influencing or bringing about other decisions than the decision of this Government, such as the immediate demobilization of all American troops and bringing them home, removal of all labels from relief goods to all countries, no United States names or any identification whatsoever that it might have come as a relief or gift package from the United States, and further again he went into the Marxist training, the extreme care which the party must under all circumstances give to their new recruits and to their retraining and their institution into the party. That was the general view and the general speech that Mr. Schneiderman made at that time.

Mr. Schneiderman, I believe, was a member of the national board of the Communist Party of the United States or a committee member thereof. Therefore, in my opinion, he could not speak anything that was contrary to the policy of the Communist Party of the United States and no one in the United States Communist Party could speak unless it was a policy of the Russian Communist Government.

As a proof I could refer back to the Duclos letter, the immediate upset of the whole Communist movement in the United States just by one Frenchman's letter. If therefore that letter had such terrific impact, naturally all other directives had their origin.

I have never seen any of the directives myself, but I do know that whatever any of the literature that came through from Embassy sources and whatnot, they were almost identical to the policy of the party that was adopted here in the United States by the Communists.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you have any direct knowledge of messages coming from the Russian Embassy to the party leadership here?

Mr. WEREB. Just the regular directives which are I believe sent through public mail and I believe every embassy has the same type of literature that they send to their constituents or their subjects and they have, those letters which I did have or copies thereof, I believe I have turned in to the Federal Bureau of Investigation at that time, but they almost identically jibe with every move of the party at that time. I do not have any of those letters in my possession because they were very hard to get, and only through different sources which I am not at this time permitted to reveal, received them.

Mr. MOULDER. But you do recall of your own personal knowledge having seen such letters from the Russian Embassy which dictated the policy to be followed by the Communists in this country?

Mr. WEREB. They were a form letter, understand, they were not a written individual letter addressed to a certain party, they were a form letter, and I imagine, this is just purely imaginary or reasoning on my part that if they were sent to this local office of the Communist

Party, that they would also be sent to other groups in other cities and headquarters of the Communist Party elsewhere in the United States.

Mr. MOULDER. The point I want to emphasize is; you know of your own personal knowledge they were sent to the local Communist organization here?

Mr. WEREB. That is correct, sir, and sometimes they were sent to what were known as supportive members. The Communist Party was divided into three groups: There were the leadership group, or the functionary group, whether they be on State, National, or other levels. Then there were your general membership, what they called the nucleus of the group. Then there was another group which were very, very hard to keep track of. I received checks at one time or another, as donations to the People's World and different drives even as high as \$50 checks. I couldn't tell you who they come from because I am not permitted to tell you that at this time. In fact, I wouldn't be too sure because it went further than myself and this came from the third group of members known as the supportive members.

Now these people actually do not partake in any Communist movements with the exception of the moneys that they give. At one time there was a report made at one of the functionary meetings that the Hollywood Club had sent \$3,000 as a soup kitchen fund to this United States Motors strike that I testified to yesterday. They were identified, only we were told in Nemmy Sparks' office, who was head of the Los Angeles County Communist Party, we were told that this came from a very loyal actors' group and he was not at liberty to say who the donors were.

Does that answer your question, sir?

Mr. MOULDER. I want to take you back to the contact with the Russian Embassy that they kept in contact with the Communist organization here locally and your assumption that they probably pursued the same practice throughout the United States. What period was that; what date, approximately?

Mr. WEREB. That began, sir, the very first letter I saw was at the inception and I think immediately after the United Nations went into effect. In other words, also again there was another instance pertaining to this man Nemmy Sparks. We went to this functionaries' closed meeting, it was also held at 124 West Sixth Street on the fifth floor; and he told us at that time, he said "Now, look, comrades, this United Nations step is a lot of bunk as far as I am concerned. It means nothing; it is an avenue, a pavement, a road that we want to travel on where and how it pleases us, and don't pay too much strict attention until you get further party orders." That was the very first time that I noticed a letter in the office from the Russian Embassy which I immediately happened to take and forwarded to the proper authorities.

Now, this letter was of no consequence outside of a directive as to Marxist or newsworthy policy, I at this time couldn't say because I don't believe anyone has testified to that and I don't have anything substantial here to show for that, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. I wish to emphasize the importance of it in this respect: That if the Russian Embassy was openly using the mails to encourage Communist activity in this country during that period of

time, then they probably are still in contact with the Communists, loyal Communists that are now active or under cover actively engaged in communism in this country today. If the Russian Embassy was so conducting its office in that manner, then they probably haven't lost contact today. How did you identify the correspondence or letters or documents that came here?

Mr. WEREB. It said it was Russian Information Service, news service, and it was sent by the Russian Embassy from Washington, sir, and that type of letter has been circulated in this city. It isn't new and I believe newspapers know of it and they have known of it for a long time that such letters do exist and such correspondence does exist.

Sometimes it does come under the guise of news and information. But many, many times in those news and informations there are things that you can read between lines.

In 1947, I believe, January, was another Communist Party day of some type or, was it a People's World drive of \$75,000? We had a speaker here known as Oleta Yates, also convicted of the Smith Act 2 years ago in the local Federal courts. This Oleta Yates spoke of further Russian policy and the guaranty of communism and socialism in such countries as France, Burma, Italy, China, Czechoslovakia, and these countries which are now sadly behind the Iron Curtain. She spoke how it was possible for these countries to get there. It was through the Marxist training of the Communist leadership, its core. Also at this meeting there were about 400 to 450 people at the Embassy auditorium. She spoke of the possibilities of other countries under Marxist and Leninist training coming under this said Russian haven. She spoke very menacingly of the foreign policy of the United States at that time. Each of them drove the objective of union leaders, union leaders, absolute labor leaders whether openly or otherwise, to be Marxist trained, strikes to be Marxist led, all activities are to be looked at not from a Fascist standpoint but a Marxist and Bolshevik standpoint. That was the outstanding thing. They switched to the Bolshevik shortly after the war was closed. I noticed in their press they avoided during Browder's period the word bolshevism as much as possible, but immediately afterward, the word became in common use.

Proletariat, all these words which in my mind are very annoying because I know what they meant and I just knew what they were driving at, to me they were very alarming so I have noticed them a little more, probably, than the average person.

There were a number of other things she repeated over and over again but again, sir, may I call your attention to that, that she too was one of the very highups in the Communist Party in the State of California. She was a member of the State board of the Communist Party in the State of California and they do not make statements, no one in the Communist Party makes statements unless they have either instructions or approval to make it so. That is all I can say on these two meetings, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. One of the functions which you performed in the Communist Party, according to your early testimony, was that of acting as press director for your club. Will you explain your duties briefly and state whether or not in the course of the performance of your duties you had occasion to meet members of the press and particularly the Daily People's World.

Mr. WEREB. I didn't have to refer to my notes here because these are very outstanding in my mind, being that they took up so much of my free time. Time allotted to rest in the evening, I spent at this People's World drive in order to carry out a sham that I stood for in the Communist Party.

Shortly after I was inducted into the Hawthorne group and I finished my 10 weeks' course in the workers' school, at the present time I do not recall how I became a press director and I was instructed I believe by the executive board of the group as to what I would do and who I would report to and get further instructions.

I was sent to Second and Spring Street, that is, I think the top floor they occupied, the publication known as the People's World. I met there a person by the name of William Weintraub. This man gave me application blanks, receipts, receipt books; the application blanks were to the party, to the Communist Party, and subscription blanks to the People's World, so if there is any doubt in anybody's mind that they were not connected I don't see why the Herald Express or some other paper would give me as a representative a card to belong to any organization or to subscribe or bring some people into the organization.

I was sent to my group and was told that I was to make a 5-minute speech at every Communist Party meeting of our group pleading to those who did not subscribe at that time to buy the paper. We had had many mobilizations, as they called it, of newspapers which would take Sunday mornings which I didn't take too much part in because I was busy with other functions in the evenings and being also appointed by the People's World known as a Communist as a district director, therefore I had other Communist groups or clubs in that area whom I contacted whose press directors I met with, and planned strategy as to fund raising, as to subscription drives, as to distribution of papers.

Mr. TAVENNER. May I interrupt you a moment.

Mr. WEREB. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were those selected as press directors of the Communist Party supposed to represent any particular group of the Communist Party?

Mr. WEREB. Each Communist club, sir, had their own press director.

Mr. TAVENNER. Attached to the Daily People's World?

Mr. WEREB. One of the offices in the Communist group. That was a "must." First was your chairman, then your membership chairman, your educational director, your press director, your literature director, your executive committee members.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am not certain I understand. Did those press directors have some function regarding the Daily People's World. I am not certain whether that is true or not.

Mr. WEREB. The only publication that we were to handle was the Daily People's World. Occasionally there came a request from some oldtimer for the Daily Worker of New York or the Sunday supplement thereof, but it was not a "must," so much, because that was obtainable at the Progressive Bookshop and many a time there were free distributions of it to different groups, but Daily People's World publication was a "must." That is the reason I held the office in the group,

was to further financialwise and the subscription drive of this newspaper.

Does that answer your question, Mr. Tavenner?

MR. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

MR. WEREB. Over the period of time these people were known to me and have met with me at the People's Daily World as district managers. Alice Ward, Sparks, one of the two is an alias, I combined the two Sparks, wife of one Nemmy Sparks.

Nathan Shapiro, a little foreign speaking man from the Hollywood area.

Elsie Monjar, a person whom I have mentioned previously, came to my home and wanted to find out why I belonged to the Communist Party.

James Dixon, Arden Westman, Anne Trojan. She was of the Rhetta group, I believe.

Edwin Hagen was a member of our group and was the person I described yesterday as being a refugee or an unwanted character from so many countries.

Ann Chernick. She also was convicted in the Smith case.

These people I have met and these people all were Communist Party members. I knew them at functionary meetings, I met with them at Communist groups. Each of them held an office in the Communist Party.

Every person working with the exception of one whom I have never seen at a closed meeting but I did see at many of the rallies, as they called them, they were members of the party.

If you didn't belong to the party directly and openly you were listed as a supportive member, but you were connected with the party if you had anything to do with the Daily People's World and the security of the Los Angeles County Communist Party saw to it that no one had that job unless you were of the three categories.

MR. TAVENNER. Did the Communist Party assist the financing of the Daily People's World by any method other than contribution of funds derived from dues?

MR. WEREB. The finances of the Daily People's World to the best of my knowledge, which I made it my business to find out, was derived in three ways: Those liberal advertisers, and that was very small, and the amount was very little, from the commercial side.

There were the funds that were raised by subscription. Then the party—that is, the Communist Party—was required to put on a fund-raising campaign at intervals. Each club was required to raise a certain amount of money besides their subscription. I conducted about 4 or 5 social affairs to this effect which were open to others than only Communist Party members, but this was for raising funds and I believe the very first successful fund raising I had in that group which was previous to any history that they made, I think was \$400, the very first time that I raised funds for them.

This repeated itself at intervals at least twice a year where you were compelled to raise funds through one means or another.

Of course the balance of the time one got after old subscribers, discontinued subscribers, new subscribers, or those who wished to have them reissued.

The People's World was sent to people by mail, it was delivered personally, it was distributed at all the riots, all disturbances, all ques-

tionable political meetings. The clubs were taxed for the amount of bundles that they had taken.

I believe if I am right I took 100 copies to the United States Motors. The club had no money in the fund at that time because they were always short, the county Communist Party took the clubs' funds if they were over \$10, I believe, or in the vicinity of \$10, they wouldn't trust a club with any more than \$10.

In other words, you had to function from whatever you could raise immediately. These papers were distributed at all these doings.

Mr. MOULDER. You say one bundle was delivered to United States Motors. That is rather vague. You didn't follow it up as to what that meant?

Mr. WEREB. I distributed those at that riot as long as I could and as I said yesterday, when distribution got a little too much and tear gas got too close, I took off.

Mr. MOULDER. I didn't understand your statement. In other words, it was delivered there for distribution among those who were participating in the strike at United States Motors?

Mr. WEREB. That is right, anywhere, sir, where they could get workers congregated and there were many a distribution at shop gates as they came out and if you couldn't sell it to them, give it to them, and the club would pay for it.

I also was treasurer for a while to the group in Hawthorne, kept accurate records. I believe two of us kept records of that club. From those funds we sent to the People's Word a certain allotment at different periods, at intervals. The People's World to my knowledge was and still is a Communist publication and all employees, agents, or distributors thereof are connected with the Communist Party, sir.

Anything else you wish to know on that, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. You mentioned a Communist bookstore. Will you tell the committee whether you know of your own knowledge that the employees of that bookstore were members of the Communist Party?

Mr. WEREB. The Progressive Bookshop employees or director of the bookstore was always a member of the Los Angeles County Committee of the Communist Party. That was the county committee. I do believe that I have a name or two here of that bookstore because I did have contact with them many times and times when the club couldn't pay their bill, I paid it, never mentioned it, because the club was always in debt for something. Ten dollars was the maximum the county would permit the club to have before they taxed you for something. There was a Lillian Alexander of the Watts Club, a temporary employee, the wife of one Hershel Alexander, the past chairman of the Watts Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Which one of the two was chairman of the Watts Communist Party?

Mr. WEREB. Hershel Alexander was the chairman of the Watts Communist Club. There was a Nettie or the nickname she used was Eddie, Baker, a woman. She was in that store continuously—that is, during business hours or hours appointed by the county, to be open for the use of different clubs to pick up literature because all Communist literature, pamphlets, directives, books, works of Stalin, Engels, and all these bums, their books were obtained from this bookstore.

The Communist Party itself at 124 West Sixth Street, just gave directives, recommendations of what books to get, what literature to get from this progressive bookshop.

Mr. MOULDER. Is that bookshop still in operation?

Mr. WEREB. I believe that is on Central Avenue somewhere, but I do not know its present number. That bookstore is still in operation and still operates the same as ever and is still under the same principles. In fact, in Canada at one time they banned bookstores of that type and we had a man in our group, a well-to-do elderly man, I will try and find his name for you from our group, he didn't attend meetings very often, but he was a very wealthy elderly man and he bought most of the books that they had banned from Canada at one time and we distributed that by mail and by other means, it didn't make any difference how, we sent them to the city council and mayor of Inglewood, mayor of Hawthorne, everybody got a copy of some type of Marxist book.

I will try to find the name. I can't recall at this time the name of the person but he did spend over a thousand dollars, I believe it was \$1,500 that he sent the check for to the Canadian Communist organization to buy these books and, as I say, they were distributed in the district and those that were not distributed were sent to this bookstore.

Anything else on that, sir?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

I would like you to tell the committee now when it was that you terminated your connection with the Communist Party.

Mr. WEREB. In the latter part of 1947 I believe that I was going about 5 nights a week against the advice of my physician, I just couldn't give up, and I just wouldn't give up, and I kept going to these places and I paid taxicabs for most of the members that had no transportation, took them to meetings and brought them home and my hours were sometimes I would say from 7:30 in the evening and my own personal working hours from 7:30 in the evening, sir, until 1 or 2 o'clock in the morning, after that would be possibly 2 hours of report writing immediately because I never went to bed until I wrote my reports and finally I had 1 attack of this coronary thrombosis that laid me up about 3 weeks, I went back again after that, sir, and I had a very serious one and afterward and the doctor said it is either that or he says I don't know what you are doing but you certainly aren't yourself, I have known you for many years, and on the advice of my physician at the last party I had to leave, and I slowly began to drift out. I attended less, I paid less attention to everything I had done. I did it that way in order not to uncover myself or my usefulness to my Government in case, so up until the time of the Smith trial I was not in the eyes of the party known as, shall we say, as the People's World put me "memory machine." or stool pigeon.

In the early part of 1948 my health was still very bad and Mr. Houston, John Houston, whom I have mentioned as our club chairman, came to my home and wanted me to sign up, that is, stay in the party, he was alone when he came and I told him, you know I can't partake fully, I just can't go on the other way, and I played the part of a very broken man, financially and physically, so I believe that I did receive 3 months' subscription free from the People's World as a gift. That just about ended it until the Smith Act, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Moulder?

Mr. MOULDER. I have no additional questions.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. I suppose, Mr. Chairman, you are going to express the thanks and appreciation of the committee to this fine gentleman.

Mr. DOYLE. You do it so much better than I do, I will be glad to have you do it.

Mr. SCHERER. I think the testimony of Mr. Wereb speaks for itself. He has rendered to his country and now to this committee a fine and outstanding service. I wish there were more Americans like him and we want to congratulate you and express to you the thanks of the Un-American Activities Committee and the Congress of the United States for this fine patriotic service at great personal sacrifice to yourself.

Mr. WEREb. May I thank you, sir, and I wish to thank the people of the United States for the opportunity that I have had for serving. I was only too happy to. Of course I am getting a little bit old for anything but at any time I can serve this committee or any organization representing the free Government of the United States, I will be very happy to serve.

Mr. DOYLE. Wouldn't it be a wonderful thing, if all over the country men such as this witness would enter into an attitude of mind toward our Government which makes this witness happy and contented to serve in terms of real financial sacrifice such as he did? Isn't that the spirit that our Nation was born with and isn't that the spirit our Nation needs really when you come down to it, a spirit of placing our national welfare against our own personal, material gain.

In other words, the Nation will only be as strong as we citizens are willing to make it by virtue of being willing to give something to our country instead of trying to tear it down.

Mr. SCHERER. Here is a man if it were possible certainly deserves a Congressional Medal of Honor.

Mr. WEREb. Thank you, sir, and I am sorry if I have been in some way unacceptable or some of my words might not have meant what I meant to say and I repeat, any time in the future you wish to call on me I will be happy to do anything I can. Thank you.

(Whereupon the witness was excused.)

Mrs. MARTHA HARD. My counsel has not arrived this morning and he is due to come when he is through with his prior appointment. I would like to request that I not be called until he comes.

Mr. DOYLE. We will be glad not to call you until he comes provided he comes in time. You are subpoenaed to be here and if you have arranged for your counsel to be here, he is expected to be here on time.

Mrs. HARD. I would like to point out, Mr. Doyle, that my counsel and I were, I was called for yesterday, my counsel and I were here all day yesterday and we waited. We were told we weren't to be called yesterday afternoon and we were here until a quarter to 6 yesterday evening, and I will be very happy to come as soon as he arrives and that should be any moment.

Mr. DOYLE. That is very good. Your counsel is familiar with the problems of either court appearance or a hearing appearance and that subpoena continues from day to day until it is possible to be

heard. That applies to congressional committees as well as to any other hearing, whether in court or a congressional hearing, but we will try to cooperate of course as we always do.

But we expect your counsel to be here and if there is any question about his being here I suggest you call him on the phone and tell him we are ready for him. We began here at 9 o'clock this morning.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. John Houston.

Mr. DOYLE. Will you please raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

Mr. HOUSTON. I do.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you very much.

TESTIMONY OF JOHN WATERS HOUSTON

Mr. TAVENNER. You are John Houston?

Mr. HOUSTON. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have a middle name?

Mr. HOUSTON. John Waters Houston.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted that you are not accompanied by counsel, Mr. Houston.

Mr. HOUSTON. No, I am not.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee desires to make it plain that a witness has the right to have counsel with him if he desires, or the right to consult counsel at any time during the course of his testimony should he so desire. You understand that, do you not?

Mr. HOUSTON. I understand.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Houston?

Mr. HOUSTON. I was born in Bozeman, Mont., September 1908.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you now reside in Los Angeles?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes, I do.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in the State of California?

Mr. HOUSTON. I have lived in California since 1941.

Mr. TAVENNER. What has been your principal occupation or trade?

Mr. HOUSTON. My principal occupation I would say would be in the educational field as a teacher.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your formal educational training has been?

Mr. HOUSTON. Well, I have a master's degree in the University of Montana and I have done postgraduate work at the Yale University and also at UCLA.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you receive your master's degree?

Mr. HOUSTON. That was in 1934.

Mr. TAVENNER. In what field did you receive your degree?

Mr. HOUSTON. It was in English. I had a lot of work in mathematics, too, at the same time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then you went to Yale University?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes, I taught school in Montana about 3 years in a small town, high-school teaching, and then decided I needed to get a Ph. D. Degree, so I went back east and went to Yale for a year.

Mr. TAVENNER. What year was that?

Mr. HOUSTON. That would have been around 1938 or 1939, one of those years. 1938 and 1939.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where did you take your undergraduate work?

Mr. HOUSTON. Undergraduate work at University of Montana at Missoula, Mont.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that immediately prior to your receiving your master's work?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes, I continued right on into the master's degree.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Houston, were you at any time a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HOUSTON. That is correct, I have been. I was a member for a short time back in Connecticut, New Haven that would be, and then I was, my participation in the Communist Party was out here in California.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HOUSTON. No, I am not. I quit, actually in my own mind I quit in 1946. I think it would be about May or June that I made the decision that I was going to get out of the Communist Party, but it wasn't until 1948 that I got out of the area where I had been active and saw no more Communists and was not pressured to attend any meetings, and since that date, I would say it would be June 1948, that would be almost, that would be 7 years ago now, I have seen none of the Communists whom I was formerly associated with except some that I have seen here at this hearing today and yesterday.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then I understand your break with the party did not become final and complete until you moved out of the environment in which you had been living?

Mr. HOUSTON. That is correct. That is, if you are a member of the Communist party the party makes every effort to activate all its members and if you are not active somebody visits you to see why you aren't and you are therefore among those people whom you have been active with and naturally you will be asked to attend meetings and do this and do that.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, it was the continuous pressure brought to bear upon you which kept you in the Communist Party as long as you did stay?

Mr. HOUSTON. I would say that, yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. And in the communities to which you moved you have had no Communist Party associations whatever?

Mr. HOUSTON. That is correct; none whatsoever.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say you were a member of the Communist Party when you were at Yale University. May I ask you whether you had had any affiliation with the Communist Party prior to that time?

Mr. HOUSTON. No. Where I first became acquainted with communism at all, strangely enough, was in the library at the University of Montana where there were some books on the subject. However, to my knowledge there was no active organized Communist group there and I was an age where I read quite a bit and I read Norman Thomas, the Socialist, first, and he mentioned the Communists and I wanted to see what the Communists had to say, so I would say I was generally familiar and in New Haven I attended some, as I recollect, some local meeting which was of a Communist tinge and there I was persuaded to get in and I did participate to some extent, though my main interest was in schoolwork but there were no Communists I knew of at the University of Yale, and I had no contact with them if there were.

Mr. MOULDER. What was your age at that time?

Mr. HOUSTON. My age at that time would be around 30 years old.

Mr. MOULDER. You were then a student at Yale?

Mr. HOUSTON. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee has received evidence regarding Communist activity at Yale, but as I understand it, you knew no one connected with the teaching profession at Yale University who was a member of your group, is that correct?

Mr. HOUSTON. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was this group of the Communist Party that you belonged to there? Was it an organized group of the student body or of the community?

Mr. HOUSTON. It was of the community in the area where I lived.

Mr. TAVENNER. No connection with the University?

Mr. HOUSTON. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. That was in 1938-39?

Mr. HOUSTON. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give the committee, please, a statement of your employment record?

Mr. HOUSTON. Well, I was employed, as I said, I worked in Montana as a school teacher for 3 years in a small town, Twin Bridges, Mont.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have any Communist Party affiliations during that period?

Mr. HOUSTON. None whatsoever.

And I attended Yale after that and after that I went to Washington, D. C., and I worked for the Republican National Committee for a while as a research assistant and at that time I was not connected with the Communist Party whatsoever, so I hope the Republicans aren't embarrassed.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you remain in Washington, employed in Washington?

Mr. HOUSTON. That would be approximately a year or a little better.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where did you live while employed in Washington?

Mr. HOUSTON. Arlington, Va.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall the address?

Mr. HOUSTON. No; I am afraid I can't.

Mr. TAVENNER. 800 North Fillmore Street?

Mr. HOUSTON. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Washington Book Shop while you lived in the city of Washington?

Mr. HOUSTON. Not that I recollect. I think I may have gone there now that you mention it.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your next employment?

Mr. HOUSTON. My next employment was, I came out to California and began to work for the Douglas Aircraft.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where was that?

Mr. HOUSTON. Santa Monica plant.

Mr. TAVENNER. What year?

Mr. HOUSTON. That would be 1941, I came in August I believe of 1941 and started right there after September.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you remain employed by the Douglas Aircraft?

Mr. HOUSTON. I worked for them for 4 years, 1941 through 1944, I think, 3 or 4 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your next employment?

Mr. HOUSTON. At Northrup Aircraft Co.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where is that located?

Mr. HOUSTON. That was in, let's see, that would be Inglewood or Hawthorne, I guess it would be; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. That employment began about the time of the termination of your employment at Douglas Aircraft?

Mr. HOUSTON. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you remain employed?

Mr. HOUSTON. To 1946.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your next employment after 1946?

Mr. HOUSTON. After 1946 I attended UCLA in attempting to get that Ph. D. which I started at Yale, but financial difficulties were too much. I was working and working at the university as assistant instructor and working on the side and my wife was working and it was just too much work, that is all, I wasn't young enough to take it. So that ended about, when would it be, I was there 2 years—1948.

Mr. TAVENNER. What did you do next?

Mr. HOUSTON. Then I went to work for Allied Fur Industry which was a fur farming company. They raised chinchilla and mink.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did your employment continue there?

Mr. HOUSTON. That would be I would say 2 years I worked for them.

Mr. TAVENNER. That would bring you up to approximately 1950, would it not?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your next employment?

Mr. HOUSTON. Then I worked for El Camino College, teacher of mathematics, 2 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. And your employment there was terminated in 1952?

Mr. HOUSTON. Correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did your former Communist Party membership have anything to do with the termination of your employment there?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes; it was. The president called me in to his office one day and told me that my name had been published in the paper, I hadn't read it, and asked me pointblank if I was a Communist. I told him "No," and he asked me if I had ever been and I said I had been, and told him about it and he asked me if I was through with it and I said I was, but he felt that the board would be, he already had some trouble in that respect with some other teachers I guess and he thought it would be better, he didn't think the board would go along with rehiring me next year, although he would have supported me, and I just resigned and decided that teaching was out, and I quit.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, let us go back to the time that you arrived in California, in approximately 1941, from Washington, when you became employed at the Douglas Aircraft plant. Had you affiliated with the Communist Party in California before being employed by the Douglas Aircraft plant, or was it after?

Mr. HOUSTON. I would say after, I believe.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, the circumstances under which you affiliated with the Communist Party in California?

Mr. HOUSTON. I don't exactly recall them. I had had of course this general interest in communism, had been in it, and as I recall I probably attended some meeting or other and then probably said I would join up.

Mr. TAVENNER. In what group of the Communist Party did you become a member?

Mr. HOUSTON. I became a member of the Hawthorne-Inglewood group, the Hawthorne Club, I guess it was at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you affiliate with any other unit or group of the Communist Party in addition to the Hawthorne group?

Mr. HOUSTON. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Your membership was confined to the Hawthorne Club?

Mr. HOUSTON. The Hawthorne club, that is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you recall or will you tell the committee more in detail about how you became a member of the Hawthorne Club?

Mr. HOUSTON. Well, that is quite a while back and the exact circumstances I don't believe I can recall, except the usual procedure would be where at some meeting you indicated your interest and were approached by some active Communist and then were inducted and put to work.

(Representative Moulder left the hearing room.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was the active Communist that saw you?

Mr. HOUSTON. I don't know. I presume it would have been Vernon Potter. That is my guess. I am not sure.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you employed in aircraft from 1941 until 1946 while you were a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HOUSTON. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were there any other members of the Hawthorne group of the Communist Party who were employed in either of these two plants, airplane plants, in which you were employed?

(Representative Moulder returned to the hearing room.)

Mr. HOUSTON. I don't remember any that worked in the Santa Monica plant and in the Northrup plant there was one girl whose name I can't recall now who came into the group from I don't know where and went out. She was a pretty militant person and that is all I can recall in the plants that I worked.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee has heard from time to time of emphasis that the Communist Party put upon Communist Party organizational work within industry. Can you tell the committee what effort was made to do organizational work within the industry in which you were employed?

Mr. HOUSTON. Well, the emphasis was of course to recruit workers and the party made every effort to have its members working in industry to try to recruit other people in the plant they were working in into the Communist Party. I didn't do that. I don't remember recruiting any person whom I worked with into the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you tell the committee what effort was made by others to recruit from your particular industry?

Mr. HOUSTON. Well, it seems to me if I remember correctly there was the industrial work of the party that was handled by industrial units, at least that occurred sometime in the history of that group, while I was there, that the members, if you were working in a particular plant and they organized a group maybe where workers didn't live near you but were Communists and in the same plant as you all meet together as a group. My recollection is that it wasn't very effective work done there in that respect.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was the Hawthorne group considered an industrial unit or was it——

Mr. HOUSTON. It was a geographical grouping. Later on it was an assembly district grouping.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with the names of industrial groups that were organized within the airplane industry?

Mr. HOUSTON. Some clubs were named after people who were respected in the movement. I can't offhand—let's see——

Mr. TAVENNER. I am not sure I made the question clear. I want to know whether there were any industrial groups of the Communist Party in which the membership was from the airplane industry.

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes, there was an aircraft group I am sure, a grouping of the aircraft workers.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you ever meet with them?

Mr. HOUSTON. As to that I don't recall. I may have at some time or other, but I would attend simply as an observer, I guess, from my group. Or perhaps it was this I heard at a section gathering of some kind of functionaries they were going to have such a meeting.

Mr. TAVENNER. It was the practice in the Communist Party, was it not, to have meetings of functionaries where the functionaries represented the various units such as the industrial units of the Communist Party and neighborhood units?

Mr. HOUSTON. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give the committee the names of the functionaries from any of these industrial units in aircraft?

Mr. HOUSTON. Well, I am sorry, I can't at this time because I have a lapse of memory, I don't recall them, I didn't have much connection with them. My work was primarily in this assembly district grouping and mainly concerned with routine duties of trying to get people to meetings and People's World drives and that sort of thing.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you become the chairman of the Hawthorne group of the Communist Party?

Mr. HOUSTON. I did at one time for a short period of time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with the witness who just preceded you on the stand, Mr. Wereb?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes, I was. He was very active in our group and I met him at his house a number of times.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you and a person by the name of Monjar engage in a security check at his home on one occasion?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes, I think we did put him on the frying pan and that would be—I was attending UCLA, most of the time as I said I had 3 jobs, trying to go to school and 2 jobs on the side and I did on some occasions participate. As I remember, I was called to Elsie Monjar's and said they were going to ask him some questions about Steve and we went over there. I believe she did most of the talking.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were called to her house to be advised to go with her over to Mr. Wereb's home?

Mr. HOUSTON. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was told you as the purpose of this trip?

Mr. HOUSTON. The purpose was to question him about his lack of understanding of Marxism and the question was, as he put it: "Why are you in the Communist Party?"

The idea would be to question him and see what his background was and what his understanding of the party philosophy was and as I remember it came out, at that inquiry it came out that he was given a clean bill of health.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Wereb has advised the committee as to what occurred at the first Communist Party meeting that he attended when you were introduced to the group as the newly elected chairman.

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall the occasion?

Mr. HOUSTON. I do, although it seems to me that that wasn't the first time he was inducted into the party, but the remarks there I find it a little hard, I don't remember myself ever thinking at that time in that way of this country being a state of the Soviet Union, or words to that effect, and of course Steve wrote it all down at the time and I have only my memory to put against his fact taking, I would say.

My recollection, if I said it, I didn't mean it that way and I think that it is twisted a little, even Wereb can make mistakes in getting stuff down. The reason I was in the Communist Party primarily at that time I think was because we were in the war, we were fighting the Germans and the Russians were on our side and the Communists were fighting for the war effort, supporting it in every way, and that was chiefly it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Wasn't it the Communist Party view at that time that the United States should be made a Soviet state, whether it be a Soviet state under the leadership of the Soviet Union or just a Soviet state?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. There may be a question?

Mr. HOUSTON. Correct, that is the objective of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. To make the United States a Soviet state?

Mr. HOUSTON. That is correct, I would say that is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. If I understand you correctly, you do not deny having made the statement attributed to you by Mr. Wereb?

Mr. HOUSTON. Well, I will say this for the record, that I think I am misquoted or quoted out of context in such a way as to give a meaning which I don't believe I ever intended to give. That is, as I can remember, I never thought of making this country a subject part of the Russian setup.

Mr. TAVENNER. But after all, there is very little distinction, isn't there, in fact between making this country a part of the Soviet Union and making it a Soviet state, actually there is very little distinction, isn't there?

Mr. HOUSTON. Perhaps there is a distinction.

Mr. DOYLE. As I understand your testimony, it is that you do state that you realized that the Communist Party during the time you were in it had the objective of making the United States of America a Soviet state, is that correct?

Mr. HOUSTON. I would say yes.

Mr. DOYLE. All right, if you say yes, there isn't much difference between what you say now and Mr. Wereb's statement that was their objective, and he heard you say that their objective was to make it the 18th because if there are only 17 states in the Soviet Union and

this became a Soviet state, it would be the 18th state, wouldn't it, and that is what he said you said, so you are not far apart, are you?

Mr. HOUSTON. Probably there is a distinction without a difference. That is, I thought, my understanding at that time would be that this country would have a setup like the Russians, but its own setup.

Mr. MOULDER. Independent of the U. S. S. R.?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes, going along with it—

Mr. MOULDER. That was your thought at the time?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes.

Mr. MOULDER. But not a part of the Soviet Union dominated by another foreign country? Was it your understanding that it was to be made an independent Soviet state? Is that the way I understand you?

Mr. HOUSTON. That is my understanding of it.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Moulder, you and I may agree but politically I can't conceive of the Soviet Union getting enough control over the United States of America to have it turn into a Soviet form of government without the Soviet Union and Russia controlling it; do you? If they give us birth as a Soviet state, sure they are our parents.

Mr. MOULDER. Don't misunderstand me. I am trying to get his thought about the matter; I wasn't expressing one of my own.

Mr. DOYLE. In other words, we become their Soviet baby and they nurse us until we are adults and then they continue to feed us, sure. My belief from what I read and know is that they definitely intended to tie us under their apron strings and give us birth as a Soviet state and then keep us tied to their apron strings. Why not? That would give them control of the world and that is what they are after, of course.

Mr. MOULDER. May I make the statement there is no contention or argument about that matter. This witness just seems to construe what I said differently from what the previous witness testified to.

Mr. HOUSTON. I would say my understanding at the time—right now I say well, it is a distinction without a difference.

Mr. DOYLE. You did say, however, that of course you recognized that the witness made notes.

Mr. HOUSTON. That is right.

Mr. DOYLE. You don't question his accuracy?

Mr. HOUSTON. Well, I wouldn't say he is a hundred percent accurate in detail. We are all human. But as I say, I can't put my memory against his writing afterward, but maybe I said it.

Mr. DOYLE. You may have said it in the enthusiasm and context of a Communist Party meeting?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. At any rate, he wrote it down and as you say his notes are probably more accurate than your memory.

Mr. MOULDER. May I say again, Witness, as I understand it, you do not affirm nor deny that, but you are making an explanation of a possible error on his part in construing the meaning of your statement?

Mr. HOUSTON. Correct. I accept that.

Mr. MOULDER. I don't know why the witness should be compelled to be placed in a position of perjury.

Mr. DOYLE. I don't, either. I had no intention in trying to clarify what I understood to be the witness' testimony. I had no intention of

placing you in the position of falsifying or anything of the sort. I want the witness to understand that.

Mr. HOUSTON. Thank you.

Mr. TAVENNER. You heard the names of the persons identified by Mr. Wereb as members of the Hawthorne group of which you were chairman?

Mr. HOUSTON. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of that group during the entire period Mr. Wereb was a member?

Mr. HOUSTON. I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. As far as you know was there any error in his identification of members of the Hawthorne group? You heard his testimony.

Mr. HOUSTON. I would say it was substantially correct, although I believe it is only fair to say that a number of those people were what would be classified, according to the Communist Party at that time, as deadwood, that is, people who are inactive. And maybe attended a meeting and the active membership certainly made valiant efforts to get them out to the meetings, but I say in the main the list is correct, although I will have to state to be truthful that I can't remember all those names. I don't recall all those names.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Houston, that is true with a lot of organizations; isn't it? They have a large membership or a membership and only a few are active and attend meetings and it is a constant struggle on the part of the active members to get out the inactive? That happens in about every organization?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. That happens in church. We do not have enough people out to church on Sunday.

Mr. HOUSTON. That is right; true.

Mr. SCHERER. Yet they are members of the church.

Mr. HOUSTON. That is right.

Mr. SCHERER. It is those what pay the dues that help support the organization and provide for the activities of those who are active.

Mr. HOUSTON. That is correct.

Mr. MOULDER. Inasmuch as you have had the courage to come before the committee and frankly admit your former Communist Party affiliations and participation in the cell or branch of the party, that you testified about, don't you wish to make some explanation. I believe you should be entitled to make some explanation of the cause or reason which induced you to become a member of the Communist Party and also what influenced you to become an active member in participation in Communist Party affairs.

Mr. HOUSTON. As near as I can say on that, I have wondered about that myself here the last 6 years particularly the last few weeks, I would say that probably it is probably my background. I had a rather tough time at home, I was young, we had hardships, didn't have enough money in our family, there was a lot of dissension in the family, and the Communist Party, what attracted me to it, was this positiveness with which they seemed to hold their opinions and the people in it, I think that is what attracted me to it. And the theory of it, to my mind the revolutionary aspect of it I more or less in my mind bracketed with the early history in Russia and I didn't buy it, didn't think

in terms of that actively here in this country, and at the time I was in the Communist Party it was what was called a revisionist period. That side of the party was soft pedalled, it was only after the Duclos letter that I began to really think the thing out a little bit and see that I was not for that. I am not a revolutionist and I don't believe in it. That is all.

I want to take this occasion for all the people who formerly knew me in the Communist Party to say that I in 1946 in my mind I quit and I quit for good. I rejected it.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you find the answer to those problems you had in your youth in the Communist Party?

Mr. HOUSTON. Well, there was a lot of activity and, no, I didn't find the answer to my problems of my youth. The only thing, as I see it now, is I just grew up and became a little more practical and began to see the world as it really is and to see that American people aren't going to buy communism. They haven't bought it and we will work out our own destiny in this country.

Mr. SCHERER. That was a good statement. Many of us as young people had financial problems.

Mr. HOUSTON. That is true. There are people in the depression that had a difficult time, more difficult even than I had and they never became interested in the Communist Party.

Mr. SCHERER. You would say that the ideology of communism is attractive; wouldn't you? On the surface it is attractive. It would have to be attractive to attract the masses.

Mr. HOUSTON. The youth particularly.

Mr. SCHERER. Actually, did it practice what it preached?

Mr. HOUSTON. No.

Mr. SCHERER. The ideology doesn't emphasize revolution, that is what you wanted to tell us?

Mr. HOUSTON. I would say that the Communist Party is the revolutionary party.

Mr. SCHERER. Does it emphasize it, though?

Mr. HOUSTON. That aspect of it is kind of left in the background. It is really only what you would call the mature Communists that think that.

Mr. SCHERER. That is, the hard core.

Mr. HOUSTON. The hard core.

Mr. SCHERER. That understand it.

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes, that understand it.

Mr. SCHERER. In other words, when you joined the party you may not have joined if you had known the substance of the Duclos letter at that time?

Mr. HOUSTON. I don't think I would have.

Mr. SCHERER. The actual and real purpose of the Communist Party is often hidden insofar as new members are concerned or in many cases insofar as the ordinary, average, inactive member is concerned?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes; I would say it is.

Mr. SCHERER. But there is no question in your mind now that its main objective has prompted men who have sought power and domination over other peoples from time immemorial, namely, power and domination and control.

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask a question there:

Witness, I have never met you, I am sure, never spoken with you. If you were listening over the radio or if the newspapers were able to print all you have said about the Communist Party being a revolutionary party, which I know they can't possibly do for lack of space and other reasons, but if any young people of the teen age or about that, high school or college age, were thinking in terms of either staying in or joining the Communist Party, should ask your experience—you are a college man, were graduated—if those young people should ask you your advice as to whether to stay in the Communist Party or of getting into it, what would you say to them?

Mr. HOUSTON. Well, I would say that what they ought to do is to work in the traditional American way for whatever reforms they think necessary; that the Communist Party is not the answer.

Mr. SCHERER. That is what we all agree, as long as the majority of the people in this country would agree on a different form of government and that different form would be brought about through constitutional means, nobody could object.

Mr. HOUSTON. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Houston, were you connected or affiliated with the Communist Party in any manner while you were employed as a teacher at college that you mentioned?

Mr. HOUSTON. La Comita College?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. HOUSTON. I was not. That was after 1948, I completely disassociated myself. I didn't see any Communists or had nothing to do with them.

Mr. TAVENNER. After you received your subpoena to appear as a witness in this hearing, did you get in touch with the staff of the committee?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes; I did. I received a letter to the effect that any person who was so subpoenaed and had any questions to ask could meet with the counsel of the committee and I did. Prior to that, 2 years prior to that I was visited by the FBI and asked about my connections and since I had quit, and determined to have nothing more to do with it, I told them what I knew about it.

Mr. TAVENNER. You voluntarily told counsel for this committee that you were willing to testify here.

Mr. HOUSTON. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. And desired to do so?

Mr. HOUSTON. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. And you were advised by counsel that you would be given every opportunity to state the reasons for your going into the Communist Party and the reasons for your getting out of it?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have already in answer to the questions of the committee members pretty well covered that field, but if there is anything else you desire to say as to the circumstances under which you got into the Communist Party and the circumstances under which you left, I want to give you an opportunity to say it.

Mr. HOUSTON. I don't believe that I can add any more to what I have said.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Moulder?

Mr. MOULDER. Nothing other than that I wish to commend you for your straightforward testimony before the committee, the admissions which you have made concerning your Communist Party affiliations and which certainly should not in any way have any unfavorable reflection upon you or you as a citizen in your occupation or work you are doing.

Mr. SCHERER. I agree with Congressman Moulder that there should be absolutely no sanctions against this man of any kind or nature by employer or fellow citizens whatsoever.

Mr. DOYLE. I feel the same, Witness, of course. I want to ask you one question, if I may, about the Duclos letter.

I have heard many witnesses, I have read much on the subject, and from your testimony about the effect the Duclos letter had on you, it awakened you to the fact that the two systems, the Soviet system, and the American system could not exist side by side in the same world: is that true? That was the claim of the Soviet Union party through the Duclos letter?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes; it indicated that the Communist Party was going to become a revolutionary party.

Mr. DOYLE. And that is as we have understood it and I think that came to this country in April or May, 1945.

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. That is as I recall it. And as I said the other day, I have come to make a good deal of allowance for people who went into the Communist Party prior to April or May 1945, but I still don't understand how any person could stay in the Communist Party very long, say a year or two or even in some cases three, after April 1945. If you allow 1 or 2 or 3 years for any patriotic American citizen to comprehend the significance of the Duclos letter, and then if they still stay in the Communist Party, they stay in with their eyes open and they are a revolutionary party.

That is my position on it. I want to commend you for what you have done and may I urge you to do everything in God's world that you can to overcome maybe even the little damage that you may realize you did while you were in it.

With your great ability and now your devoted dedication to your country as contrasted to what you were dedicated to even as a scholar, won't you devote some of your material and spiritual resources and your fine education to helping even teen-agers, because you have had a great education in the university.

Mr. SCHERER. I think by his appearance here on the stand he has done that in a great measure.

Mr. DOYLE. I know that, Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHERER. I know what you mean, but I just wanted to comment.

Mr. DOYLE. Still you are in such a strategic position, won't you think in terms of putting out some of your fine ability and educational resources to counteract that. We urge you to do it, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Chairman, may I add that all of us if we had had the power of foresight as good as our hindsight might have changed the course of conduct of our lives.

I merely wish to add to what has already been said, that I hope this committee will cooperate in every way possible in the event your testimony and honest admissions and statements here before the committee, in injury to you results. If that occurs the committee should cooperate to render you such assistance as it can to rehabilitate yourself or to adjust any injury that might come about as a result of your appearance before the committee.

Mr. HOUSTON. Thank you.

Mr. DOYLE. That is our established policy all over the country and we will be glad to apply that to you, sir.

Mr. HOUSTON. I appreciate that.

Mr. DOYLE. Are there any other questions of the witness?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. I have no questions.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you very much.

(Whereupon the witness was excused.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Harry Hay.

Mr. HAY. May I beg allowance of this committee to have counsel sit on the right hand side. I have very poor hearing on the left.

Mr. DOYLE. Yes, indeed. Counsel should always be in the right. Let's adjourn for 5 minutes before you are sworn in.

(Brief recess.)

Mr. DOYLE. Do you solemnly swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. HAY. I do.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you.

Let the record show that the committee reconvenes after the recess and that a legal quorum of the committee is here, Mr. Scherer, of Ohio, Mr. Moulder, of Missouri, and Mr. Doyle, of California.

TESTIMONY OF HARRY HAY, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, FRANK PESTANA

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state your name, please, sir?

Mr. HAY. My name is Harry Hay.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted you are accompanied by counsel. Will counsel please identify himself.

Mr. PESTANA. Frank Pestana, P-e-s-t-a-n-a.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Hay?

Mr. HAY. April 7, 1912, in Worthing, England.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you first arrive in this country?

Mr. HAY. My father and mother were American citizens at the time of my birth and the family returned to the United States at the end of 1916.

Mr. TAVENNER. Therefore you are an American citizen.

Mr. HAY. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you now reside in Los Angeles?

Mr. HAY. We came here to Los Angeles in 1916, and we have been here ever since.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation, please, sir?

Mr. HAY. I am a production control engineer.

Mr. TAVENNER. In what industry?

Mr. HAY. We make burners and boilers for basic industry.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your formal educational training has been?

Mr. HAY. Yes; I would say that in the beginning the position of production control engineer up until about 1947 or 1948 did not have regular university training so that my education for that is partly formal and partly applicatory in the field. I will do the best I can in that field, 6 years of grade school, 3 years of junior high school. Because I was graduated from high school before I was 14 I went through 3 years and dropped back and took 2 additional years of electives so I had 5 years of high school.

Two years at Stanford; financial difficulties made it impossible for me to continue, so that in preparation for the type of work I do now, I had approximately 2 years in historical research, 1 year in record research, 1 year in market analysis, 1 year in actual practice as a foundry man, 3 years, 1 year in architectural—

Mr. TAVENNER. I didn't mean for you to go into the detail of stating your curriculum.

Mr. HAY. I suggested these things because to speak of yourself as a production control engineer without a degree sometimes seems a little strange. Would you like me to stop now?

Mr. TAVENNER. If you have covered in a general way, that is sufficient. If you have not, I don't want to limit you.

Mr. HAY. I would simply want to mention 3 years as a small tool analysis and material planning and 2 years in production planning.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you also engaged in the profession of teaching in addition to the other occupation which you mentioned?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. HAY. My Chairman, I must decline to answer that question on the first and the fifth amendments.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you had any training in music?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. HAY. I must decline to answer that question on the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. TAVENNER. Investigation by the committee discloses that under the schedule of classes for the winter of 1950 of the California Labor School you were an instructor of a class in music and the people's struggle through the centuries. Did you actually teach such a course in the California Labor School?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, I am compelled to answer by declining to answer your question for the reason of the first and the fifth amendments.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether the Communist Party in Los Angeles on the county level selected persons to teach in the California Labor School?

Mr. HAY. I beg your pardon. Is that the whole question?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. HAY. Would you repeat it?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, I will try to repeat it.

Do you know whether or not the Communist Party in Los Angeles on a county level selected those who were to teach in the California Labor School?

Mr. HAY. I decline to answer that for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you given instructions by the Communist Party to conduct classes on any occasion?

Mr. HAY. I decline for the same reasons, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Wereb, who appeared as a witness yesterday, and also this morning, stated that you had been sent by the educational director of the Communist Party in Los Angeles to the Hawthorne Club of the Communist Party to give a course of instruction. Was that an accurate statement by him?

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, you are asking me to give an opinion, I believe, in this case. I wish to state that I have neither opinions nor recollections to give to stoolpigeons and their buddies on this committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let's put the question in a different form.

Were you instructed by the educational director of the Communist Party to conduct classes in the Hawthorne group of the Communist Party?

Mr. HAY. I decline to answer that based upon the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. SCHERER. You called Mr. Wereb a stoolpigeon. Is anything he said about you untrue?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. HAY. I decline to answer that based upon the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. SCHERER. It certainly comes with ill grace to tag a man like Mr. Wereb as you have and then refuse to say whether what he said about you was untrue or not.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, this is your opinion. You may keep it.

Mr. SCHERER. It certainly is and it is opinion founded on a little testimony and a little experience on this committee.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Chairman, some of the altercation that went on with the last witness—I might suggest a question in that direction.

Mr. DOYLE. May I have that statement? What do you say, please?

Mr. HAY. In effect, Mr. Chairman, what I said a moment ago was that some of the altercation concerning the last witness in this chair might suggest a difference of opinion on that matter.

Mr. DOYLE. Altercation? I wasn't aware there was any altercation with the last witness.

Mr. SCHERER. I think I know what he means.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Hay, did you in January or February of 1947 conduct a Marxist school in Los Angeles?

Mr. HAY. I decline to answer that question based on the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party in 1947?

Mr. HAY. I decline for the same reasons, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HAY. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party in 1950?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. HAY. I decline to state on the first and fifth amendments, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party in 1954?

Mr. HAY. I decline to state on the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party yesterday?

Mr. HAY. I decline to state on the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, is it just on Saturdays that you are not a member of the Communist Party?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. HAY. I decline to answer that, Mr. Chairman, on the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party this morning when you entered this hearing room?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. HAY. I decline to state on the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is it a plan of the Communist Party that when a Communist Party member is called to testify before this committee that he is to deny membership for the period of time he is on the witness stand?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. HAY. On the advice of counsel I decline to answer that one on the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. DOYLE. Any questions?

Mr. SCHERER. No questions.

Mr. MOULDER. No questions.

Mr. DOYLE. No questions. Thank you very much.

(Whereupon the witness was excused.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Martha Hard Wheeldin.

Mr. DOYLE. Do you solemnly swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. WHEELDIN. I do.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you.

TESTIMONY OF MRS. MARTHA HARD WHEELDIN, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, EDWARD CARTER MADDOX

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please?

Mrs. WHEELDIN. Martha Hard Wheeldin.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted you are accompanied by counsel. Will counsel please identify himself for the record.

Mr. MADDOX. Edward Carter Maddox. I practice law in Los Angeles.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a native of California?

Mrs. WHEELDIN. In the interest of saving time for the committee, I understand you don't want to work after 12 o'clock—

Mr. DOYLE. We will work as late as necessary. We have plenty of time to hear the witness fully. We would like to be out by 12. If it keeps us to 2 or 3 this afternoon, we will perform our duty so don't worry about that.

Mrs. WHEELDIN. Well, I was going to say that in light of the nature of the inquiry—and I have been here and observed the nature of it throughout the week—that I do not intend to answer any of the type of questions that have been directed to various witnesses.

Mr. DOYLE. None has been directed to you yet, so please don't anticipate. We may change our line of questions as to you.

Mrs. WHEELDIN. Any further questions that are not in the same nature of inquiry would therefore be not pertinent to the subject and would be out of order.

Mr. DOYLE. We will decide what we think is pertinent and you rely upon the advice of your counsel. We will perform our duty and your counsel will perform his. So let's proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you answer the question, please?

Mrs. WHEELDIN. What was the question, sir?

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a native of California?

Mrs. WHEELDIN. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where were you born?

Mrs. WHEELDIN. This question, sir, I hesitate to answer in light of some of the previous—

Mr. DOYLE. I instruct you to answer. We are not satisfied with your answer and you know we would not be. I direct you to answer the question.

Mrs. WHEELDIN. I will be glad to answer if I am not told to go back where I came from as some of the previous witnesses were.

Mr. DOYLE. This committee has no jurisdiction to tell you where to go. We have never done it. Now please don't be facetious. Just proceed in a dignified manner.

Mrs. WHEELDIN. I was born in Suchow, China.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you come to this country?

Mrs. WHEELDIN. I don't recall exactly, sir, I was a few months of age.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a naturalized American citizen?

Mrs. WHEELDIN. No, I am a citizen by birth.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in California?

Mrs. WHEELDIN. I don't quite understand that question. I first came to California, again I don't recall exactly, I was only about 8 years of age at the time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you lived here continuously since then?

Mrs. WHEELDIN. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, then, please tell us what other places it was where you lived.

Mrs. WHEELDIN. That is a rather involved question. Do you want me to go into all the places I have been?

Mr. TAVENNER. No. Let us begin with 1945 and tell us where you have lived since that time.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. WHEELDIN. Well, sir, I hardly see that this is pertinent and if it is pertinent then it behooves me to resort to the first and fifth amendments and decline to answer your question.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that the witness be directed to answer.

Mr. DOYLE. We believe it is a pertinent and proper question and I instruct you to answer.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. WHEELDIN. You said since 1945: is that correct?

Mr. TAVENNER. I will change the question and make it 1944.

Mrs. WHEELDIN. I have lived in California since 1944.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where in California?

Mrs. WHEELDIN. In Los Angeles County.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you reside in Los Angeles now?

Mrs. WHEELDIN. No, I do not, sir. Do you mean county or city?

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, where do you reside?

Mrs. WHEELDIN. At the present time I live in Pasadena.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived there?

Mrs. WHEELDIN. I have to stop and think a minute. I would say roughly speaking around 10 years.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation?

Mrs. WHEELDIN. I am a housewife, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have any business or occupation in which you are engaged other than that of being a housewife?

Mrs. WHEELDIN. I have a profession. However, I am, at present I have no work, I have no job at all, I am a housewife.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your profession?

Mrs. WHEELDIN. By profession I am a social worker.

Mr. TAVENNER. When were you last engaged in the practice of that profession?

Mrs. WHEELDIN. Sir, if this question is pertinent, and I doubt that it is, I would like to ask for direction of the committee as to whether or not the question is pertinent, I don't—

Mr. DOYLE. Our distinguished counsel asked you a question and he doesn't waste his time or your time in asking any questions that are not pertinent. We are not satisfied with your answer. You didn't answer it. I direct you to answer it.

Mrs. WHEELDIN. Well, sir, on the basis of my rights as very definitely established in the first amendment guaranteeing me the right of free speech, free association, and the right I have not to inquire into my private affairs and also upon the fifth amendment, which I do take at this time also in view of the nature of the whole nature of this type of inquiry that you have been conducting here, which corresponds to the inquisition during the 1700's—

Mr. DOYLE. You have a right to stand on your constitutional privilege. We always admire a person who does it honestly, in good faith, but I am not going to allow you to take this forum to make a speech.

Mrs. WHEELDIN. I have stated my reasons for refusing to answer the questions, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you plead the constitutional privileges?

Mrs. WHEELDIN. I think I made that clear.

Mr. DOYLE. I didn't think you made it quite clear enough for the record. If you will claim your constitutional privilege—

Mrs. WHEELDIN. I have done so, the first and the fifth amendments.

Mr. DOYLE. You stand upon those?

Mrs. WHEELDIN. Yes, I do.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you active in PTA work in Pasadena?

Mrs. WHEELDIN. Again I question the pertinency of such questions.

Mr. TAVENNER. May I ask a direction of the witness?

Mr. DOYLE. We are instructed by Congress to investigate Communist Party activity wherever it is, whether it is in the schools or labor or anything, any group. We believe therefore it is pertinent. I instruct you to answer the question.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mr. WHEELDIN. I don't quite understand what you mean by active.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a member of the PTA?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. WHEELDIN. Yes, I am a member of the PTA.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you take active part in its work?

Mrs. WHEELDIN. I still don't understand what you mean by active. Do you mean am I an officer or what?

Mr. TAVENNER. I want to know what your activity is in the PTA. You know better than I do.

Mrs. WHEELDIN. I am a member and that is about the extent of it.

Mr. SCHERER. Witness, aren't you very active, in fact, so active that your picture has appeared in magazines in connection with your activity in schoolwork and PTA work and in controversies arising over school matters?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. WHEELDIN. Mr. Scherer, you seem to know more about that than I do.

Mr. SCHERER. Will you answer the question?

Mrs. WHEELDIN. What is the question?

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Tavenner asked you whether you were active in PTA work and you didn't seem to know—

Mrs. WHEELDIN. I have answered the question.

Mr. SCHERER. You asked me a question and I want to explain my question. Mr. Tavenner asked you whether or not you were active in the PTA work. You have fenced with him and dodged the question and said you didn't know what "active" meant, you were merely a member. Now I am calling your attention to information that has come to me and asking you isn't it a fact that you were active to such an extent that I believe it was Life magazine that carried your picture showing your activities in connection with PTA and schoolwork.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. WHEELDIN. Well, sir, I have belonged to the PTA for many years, ever since I had children in the school system because I feel this is an important part of my responsibility as a parent and if you refer to a picture that appeared in Life, yes, I saw it, too.

Mr. SCHERER. That is all.

Mr. TAVENNER. That of course was based on your activity in the PTA, was it not?

Mrs. WHEELDIN. I would hardly say so.

Mr. SCHERER. What was it based on?

Mrs. WHEELDIN. I don't know what you have reference to, what was it based on. It is a very ambiguous question.

Mr. SCHERER. Well, it was based on a controversy, then, in an educational matter in Pasadena, was it not?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. WHEELDIN. Any further—

Mr. SCHERER. I asked you a question.

Mrs. WHEELDIN. I thought he was speaking.

Mr. SCHERER. He was talking to my colleague. Will you read the question to the witness?

(The reporter read from his notes as requested.)

Mr. SCHERER. That is the question.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. WHEELDIN. Well, sir, it sounds like a rather opinionated question. It calls for stating my opinion and I have no opinion on it. I think the story in the magazine itself tells you what you might want to know.

Mr. SCHERER. What was it based on then? You tell us.

Mrs. WHEELDIN. What was what based on?

Mr. SCHERER. You just admitted that your picture appeared in Life magazine and I asked you if it didn't appear in connection with a

controversy in the educational system of Pasadena. Or did it appear in connection with some other activity or event. That question is clear.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. WHEELDIN. I see what you mean.

Well, this was around Pasadena schools, yes.

Mr. SCHERER. That is all I want to know.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your name prior to your marriage?

Mrs. WHEELDIN. My maiden name, sir?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mrs. WHEELDIN. Snell.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever been known by the name of Martha Hard?

Mrs. WHEELDIN. It is my name, sir, I was married previously.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was your name Martha Hard during the period of 1945 to 1948?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. WHEELDIN. I decline to answer on the basis of the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness—

Mr. DOYLE. We cannot accept your answer and I direct you to answer the question.

Mrs. WHEELDIN. I decline to answer on the basis of the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you in the hearing room yesterday during the period of time that Mr. Wereb testified regarding a functionary meeting of the Communist Party at which he named those functionaries who were present?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mr. DOYLE. The witness volunteered the statement she had been in the hearing room all week.

Mrs. WHEELDIN. I was here yesterday, if that is what you mean.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. Did you hear Mr. Wereb identify you as a functionary of the Communist Party who attended a functionary meeting attended by him?

Mrs. WHEELDIN. I decline to answer on the basis of the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer because Mr. Tavenner only asked if she heard that part of Mr. Wereb's testimony.

Mr. DOYLE. We do not accept your answer, Madam Witness, and I direct you to answer.

Mr. SCHERER. Couldn't possibly incriminate her.

Mrs. WHEELDIN. Yes, in a whole day's testimony I truly can't trust my recollection of everything the witness said. If you want to have the record retaped or reread—

Mr. DOYLE. Not even about yourself. You couldn't trust your memory as to that? I ask you that.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. WHEELDIN. I can't even trust my recollection as to that.

Mr. DOYLE. As to yourself, what you heard him say?

Mrs. WHEELDIN. I stand on what I have said.

Mr. DOYLE. You understand the question is whether or not you heard him; heard what he said?

Mrs. WHEELDIN. I heard some of the things he said.

Mr. DOYLE. About you.

Mrs. WHEELDIN. I do not recall all of the things he said.

Mr. DOYLE. About you? I notice you were close by him when he was testifying.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mr. SCHERER. May I pursue it?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes, indeed.

Mrs. WHEELDIN. I recall him having said the name Martha Hard, but I have no basis for knowing that is the same person as me. There are other persons by such name.

Mr. TAVENNER. To be certain about this, were you a member of the Hawthorne group of the Communist Party?

Mrs. WHEELDIN. I decline to answer on the basis of the first and fifth amendments. I do not feel that you can call me to answer such a question in the light of the type of inquiry you have been conducting.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of any group of the Communist Party other than the Hawthorne group?

Mrs. WHEELDIN. Again I decline on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. You indicated some uncertainty as to the testimony of Mr. Wereb relating to Martha Hard. His testimony was that Martha Hard, a functionary of the Communist Party, attended a functionaries' meeting which he also attended. Were you a functionary of the Communist Party?

Mrs. WHEELDIN. I decline to answer your question, sir, for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. To your knowledge, did you attend any Communist Party meeting which was also attended by Mr. Wereb?

Mrs. WHEELDIN. Again, sir, I decline to answer. As I told you when I made my original statement in the interest of saving time there would be no need of asking me questions on any of this area because I decline to answer them on the basis of the first and the fifth amendments, which I am sure you are as well aware of their meaning as I am.

Mr. SCHERER. Will you look around, Witness, and look at the gentleman standing there—stand up—look at the gentleman—

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mr. SCHERER. Do you know that gentleman?

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mrs. WHEELDIN. I refuse to answer such a question on the basis of the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Tavenner just told you what he said when he was on the stand the other day. Was that testimony about you true?

Mrs. WHEELDIN. Sir, I decline to answer on the reasons previously stated, and again I say in the interest of saving time there is really no point in asking me such questions, because I will continue to decline to answer.

Mr. DOYLE. I wish to answer you, Madam, you needn't worry about saving our time. We have plenty of time.

Mrs. WHEELDIN. I have time. Time is valuable to me, too. My housework and children have been neglected this week.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you given any Communist Party assignment in Pasadena?

Mrs. WHEELDIN. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. WHEELDIN. Generally I decline to answer on the grounds of the first and the fifth amendments and I do not feel that anybody has a right to ask such a question.

Mr. DOYLE. Of course under Public Law 601 we are delegated by your Congress, your United States Congress, to ask that very question in the field of subversive activities of the Communist Party or any other subversive group.

(The witness conferred with her counsel.)

Mr. DOYLE. We are on an investigation of subversive activities. We know of no Supreme Court decision which stops us from investigating in any field in which we can legislate and clearly the United States Congress has and no doubt will further legislate in the field of subversive activities. So when we ask you about Communist Party activities, it is an illegal party, it is a subversive outfit, has been so declared and recognized, we believe it pertinent.

Mrs. WHEELDIN. Sir, your investigation may well be in order as long as it does not violate my constitutional rights. The Constitution has been in effect in this country for many years and I trust will continue for many years.

Mr. DOYLE. That is right. We are certainly in agreement on that and of course the Communist Party is known to us as an outfit, a gang, a conspiracy that would forcibly overthrow that form of constitutional government. I think you know that, you may know it.

Mrs. WHEELDIN. I am not anxious to get into an argument with you about the Constitution or anything else.

Mr. DOYLE. I know that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been a member of the Communist Party at any time?

Mrs. WHEELDIN. I decline to answer that question on the same ground as previously stated. It is the same question.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. MOULDER. No reflection is to be made upon the Parent-Teachers Association as a result of questions asked. It is not the purpose of the committee to investigate the Parent-Teachers Association, which is one of the most important, effective, and finest influential organizations in this country. I want to make that clear.

Your membership and activity in that organization certainly should not be criticized, you should be commended for any Parent-Teachers Association work that you have performed. I make that statement to clarify that it is not our purpose to investigate the Parent-Teachers Association.

Mr. SCHERER. I agree with what Mr. Moulder says about PTA, but of course we are interested in determining whether or not Communists belong or are active in any organization whether it be PTA, labor union, fraternal organization, or what. That is the purpose of the questions.

Mr. MOULDER. I want to make our position clear. I don't know whether there is any testimony as to whether in the interests of the Communists she was a member of the Parent Teachers Association. That is my point.

Mr. DOYLE. I am glad you made that statement, Mr. Moulder. I concur in it. As a matter of fact, I used to be president of a PTA.

Mr. SCHERER. I am a member now.

Mr. DOYLE. You are a member now?

Mr. SCHERER. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. There is nothing wrong with the PTA.

Mr. DOYLE. Let's congratulate the PTA on having a member like you, Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHERER. Thank you.

Mr. DOYLE. I want to congratulate the PTA on the great work they have done and always do, but that doesn't stop us as a congressional committee from trying to find out the extent to which the Communist conspiracy even tries to infiltrate the PTA and other groups. That is our job and we would hope that this witness might try to help us.

Any other questions?

Mr. MOULDER. I understand that. I wanted to clarify the point that we are not investigating the Parent-Teachers Association here or anywhere else.

Mr. DOYLE. That is right. We are investigating individuals.

Any question?

Mr. MOULDER. We could ask the question as to whether or not she has ever held any official position in that Parent Teachers Association?

Mr. DOYLE. We did ask that.

Mr. MOULDER. You just asked about the extent of her activities but every parent who is a member will be active to some extent. I don't know to what extent she was active.

Mr. DOYLE. Any questions, Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. I have no questions.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you, Madam Witness, and Counsel. You are excused.

(Whereupon the witness was excused.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Louis Stark.

Mr. DOYLE. Do you solemnly swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. STARK. I do.

TESTIMONY OF LOUIS STARK, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, ROBERT KENNY

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please, sir?

Mr. STARK. Louis Stark.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted you are accompanied by counsel. Will counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. KENNY. Robert Kenny, Los Angeles.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Stark?

Mr. STARK. December 4, 1915, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where?

Mr. STARK. In New York City.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you now reside in Los Angeles?

Mr. STARK. That is correct, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you first come to California?

Mr. STARK. Approximately 35 years ago, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you lived here continuously since that time?

Mr. STARK. Continuously with the exception of a period from March 1941 to—this is a copy of my honorable discharge here—period

of March 1941 to November 16, 1945, when I was discharged at Fort McArthur. Other than that period I resided in Los Angeles.

Mr. TAVENNER. You served overseas in the fighting forces of the United States?

Mr. STARK. I was a member of the 355th Infantry.

To those who were in the Pacific, we were more fortunate. We were in Europe. I was an infantryman, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee what your educational training has been?

Mr. STARK. I have been educated in the Los Angeles school system, sir. I had 6 years of grammar school, junior high school, graduate of high school. I attended evening high school for perhaps a period of a year or more at various times.

That is the extent of my formal education.

Mr. TAVENNER. How were you employed between 1945 and 1948? (The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. STARK. During that period, sir, I believe I was primarily self-employed in the produce business.

Mr. TAVENNER. During that period of time were you acquainted with Mr. Stephen Wereb, either by his true name as Stephen Weber or by his name as Stephen Wereb?

Mr. STARK. I must refuse to answer that question based on my rights under the Constitution, the first and fifth amendments, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think you were present in the hearing while Mr. Wereb testified regarding your participation in Communist Party activities during that period of 1945 to 1948, were you not?

Mr. STARK. I have been in the committee hearing room on and off Friday and again today, sir. I have been in and out of the room at various times.

Mr. TAVENNER. If you heard his testimony relating to you, I do not want to take the time to repeat it, if you didn't I will repeat it or attempt to refresh your recollection.

Mr. STARK. Well, sir, in view of the fact that I have been in and out, I would not be in a position to know whether I had heard all of his testimony.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you hear his testimony as it related to you?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. STARK. Sir, the record will have to speak for itself. I personally am not sure.

Mr. SCHERER. You are not sure whether you heard his testimony as related to you?

Mr. STARK. Completely, I couldn't be sure because I was not here all the time. The record will be complete and I do not have it.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you hear him say anything about you at all?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. STARK. I am not sure, sir, and I will have to depend on the record.

Mr. SCHERER. You mean you are not sure whether you heard him mention your name at all?

Mr. STARK. Sir, I will have to rely on my previous answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Wereb testified to the effect that there were a number of occasions where Communist Party classes were conducted in your home at which you were present.

Mr. STARK. I must refuse to answer that question based on the reasons previously given, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I haven't actually asked you whether that occurred or not, but I will ask you now. Were you present at any such classes, when such classes were held at your home?

Mr. STARK. I must reply the same way, sir. I refuse to answer based on my rights and in a sense obligations to the Constitution under the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Hawthorne group of the Communist Party?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. STARK. I refuse, sir, for the reasons previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. It was also testified to that you acted as the liaison between the Communist Party and certain political groups. Did you act as such a liaison?

Mr. STARK. I must refuse to answer that question based on the reasons previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a candidate for Congress on the Independent Progressive Party ticket in 1948?

Mr. STARK. I cross-filed as a member, as a candidate under the Independent Progressive Party, but due to the actual laws of this State governing elections, I have always been a registered Democrat, sir, and ran as a Democratic candidate and if I had had the funds at the time probably would have run as a Republican, as well. The termination of the election was that the Democratic candidate won not only his but the Republican nomination as well and apparently won nothing.

Mr. TAVENNER. In that campaign were you essentially the candidate of the Independent Progressive Party?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. STARK. I really can't answer that question, it is rather ambiguous, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you discuss your candidacy on the ticket of the Independent Progressive Party with functionaries of the Communist Party prior to your filing as a candidate with the Independent Progressive Party?

Mr. STARK. I am sorry I interrupted you, but I believe I gathered the sense of your question and I must refuse to answer that on the first supported by the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with the membership of the committee for the Independent Progressive Party at the time of your candidacy?

Mr. STARK. I must for the reasons previously stated refuse to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, how many of the members of that committee were members of the Communist Party?

Mr. STARK. My answer to that, sir, in view of the fact that it is a similar question, must be the same.

Mr. DOYLE. I think, Mr. Tavenner, our evidence is that by far more than one was a member of that group, I mean more than one Communist was a member of the IPP committee in control at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a photostatic copy of declaration of candidacy as an Independent Progressive Party candidate for nomi-

nation to the office of Congressman from the 17th District, June 1, 1948. On the second page of which appears the signature of the candidate, to which is attached sponsors certificate showing signatures required by law to be obtained.

Will you examine the document, please, and state whether or not that is your signature on the second page as candidate?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. STARK. I am sorry, sir, I have the document but I have lost the question directed to it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you examine the second page and state whether or not the signature there of the candidate is your signature?

Mr. STARK. I decline to answer that, sir, based on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you examine the list of sponsors which follow?

Mr. STARK. I have done that, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have done that?

Mr. STARK. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. If you will examine the document, I am certain you will see names of people identified by Mr. Wereb as members of the Hawthorne group of the Communist Party.

Will you tell the committee, please, which of those you agree with Mr. Wereb were members of the Communist Party?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. STARK. I refuse to answer that question, sir, on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are at perfect liberty to make any explanation you desire.

Mr. STARK. I realize that, sir, but I must rely on advice of counsel, whom I have implicit faith in. This is more complicated than I had originally thought, sir, and counsel is aware of my position, as is the chairman.

Mr. TAVENNER. What complicated situation do you speak of?

Mr. STARK. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend a meeting of the Communist Party at which your candidacy as an Independent Progressive Party candidate was urged?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. STARK. I would like to reiterate, sir, that I never was a candidate of the Independent Progressive Party. I have always been a registered Democrat and ran on that, as a Democrat. I crossfiled, which is a part of the election laws of this State as a candidate for the Progressive Party and did not run as a candidate of that party in the runoffs because I was not eligible.

Mr. MOULDER. You say if you had had the filing fee you would also have filed on the Republican ticket?

Mr. STARK. It is a practice used by all of the politicians—

Mr. SCHIERER. He said he was a registered Democrat.

Mr. STARK. I would have run if I had had the additional filing fee, sir, as a Republican.

Mr. SCHIERER. I agree that he would have filed if he had had the fee. I doubt if the Republicans would have let him run.

Mr. TAVENNER. The declaration of candidacy I hand you states:

I hereby declare myself an Independent Progressive Party candidate for nomination.

Doesn't that make you a candidate for nomination on the Independent Progressive Party ticket?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. STARK. The document speaks for itself, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, then, it is true that if it speaks the truth that you were a candidate, an Independent Progressive Party candidate. If that is not true, please so state.

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. STARK. Well, sir, apparently it would take a good deal of time to understand the peculiar election laws in this State which is evident in the document, but the document must speak for itself, confusing as it is.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me see if I can clear it up. Does that language indicate that though you may have been a candidate on some other ticket that this meant crossfiling?

Mr. STARK. Yes, it does, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am trying to get the facts. That is what I want to know.

Mr. STARK. As I say, the general practice is for candidates for political office to file on all parties.

Mr. SCHERER. That is not the general practice.

Mr. STARK. The general practice——

Mr. SCHERER. To file in all three parties? I thought they filed in the Democratic and Republican primaries.

Mr. STARK. Many of them did. I am not qualified to state how many, but I think many of them did.

Mr. DOYLE. I think in view of the fact that I am a California Congressman and a registered Democrat, I wish to state it wasn't the general practice as far as I am concerned. I never filed in the IPP, cross-filed. I did crossfile in the Republican Party and I think I won its nomination, too, once in a while.

Mr. STARK. Well, sir, it might be profitable to go to the secretary of State for a matter of record and engage in research to determine how many candidates for political office did this. I have no way of saying at the present time.

Mr. TAVENNER. The point I have asked you to clear up is: What part did the Communist Party play in your crossfiling or participation in that election on the Independent Progressive Party ticket.

Mr. STARK. I must refuse to answer that question based on the grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee whether or not the Communist Party at that time controlled and directed the Independent Progressive Party in its function?

Mr. STARK. I cannot answer that question based on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. DOYLE. I think Mr. Tavenner as a California Congressman I think it has been discovered that in those days in too large manner the Communist Party in California did control too much entirely the policy and practices of the IPP party. That was discovered by me and it was discovered by many California Congressmen and it is

self-evident and I think that the IPP is still infiltrated with too many Communists and that the IPP is—that is, the Communist members of the IPP party, formerly IPP party because it isn't now, legally qualified in California as I understand it, are now trying to infiltrate the Democratic and Republican political machinery in Los Angeles County and other counties in California. No question about that.

Mr. SCHERER. They have a hard time getting in the Republican Party, don't they?

Mr. DOYLE. They get in the Republican Party too often and too often in the Democratic Party. They get into both parties. But they still have the same Communist intent and purpose in my book. I think I know a few of them.

Mr. MOULDER. There was a question asked you as to whether or not you are now a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. STARK. I am not now a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party at the time you were a candidate for Congress?

Mr. STARK. I refuse to answer that question based on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Independent Progressive Party?

Mr. STARK. I was never a member to the best of my knowledge.

Mr. TAVENNER. Never a member?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. STARK. Never registered, I will put it that way, as a member of the Independent Progressive Party. I was always registered since I was a little whelp in this city as a Democrat.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Tavenner, the law used to be in California we could cross-file into other parties without being registered in that party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, I understand.

Were you a member of the Communist Party in 1954?

Mr. STARK. I refuse to answer that question based on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you cease to become a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. STARK. I refuse to answer that question based on the same grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. You desire to rely upon your statement that you are not now a member of the Communist Party, but will give no other facts relating to membership?

Mr. STARK. That is right, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I want to give you every opportunity to explain your answer, how you got out of the Communist Party, if you did.

Mr. STARK. I have no legal training and I must, as you know I must, give that answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. This committee has no information indicating that you are not a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. STARK. I am aware of that, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. It has evidence that you were a member of the Communist Party in 1948. I want to give you every opportunity to—

Mr. STARK. I am not now a Communist, sir. Beyond that I can answer no questions.

Mr. TAVENNER. You do not desire to go any further with the matter?

Mr. STARK. Under the rights as I understand them, under the Constitution, without implying, although unfortunately in the minds of many people the use of these amendments which were put into our Constitution and a great deal of hard work by many Americans whom I have always admired historically, these are now being misconstrued and I use them as they were intended to be.

Mr. SCHERER. I do think this witness has properly invoked the fifth amendment and he is to be complimented on his demeanor and attitude here as a witness.

Mr. TAVENNER. I want to be sure to give him every possible opportunity to explain his action if he desires to do so.

Mr. STARK. Counsel knows the reasons that I——

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. MOULDER. Let me ask a question: Have you ever knowingly engaged in any espionage or subversive activities?

Mr. STARK. No, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Have you ever knowingly committed any acts of disloyalty to your country, the United States of America?

Mr. STARK. Unequivocally no, sir, and I might add that I will resent and have in the past and in the last few days, any implications of that, and without going into any braggadocio I think my activity in this city socially and politically, going back to the recall of Mayor Frank Shaw——

Mr. MOULDER. I merely asked you the question to give you an opportunity to make that statement in explanation.

Mr. STARK. I have not, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. We have not tried to leave that impression or create any such implication.

Mr. STARK. I appreciate that.

Mr. SCHERER. I think your attitude toward the committee has been splendid, that you properly invoked the fifth amendment.

Mr. STARK. I tried to do it honestly.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOULDER. Did you testify as to your service in the Armed Forces of the United States?

Mr. STARK. Yes, sir; I was in the service; for a period of less than 5 years and, as I say, I have several items which I treasure most. One is the Combat Infantryman's Badge, and the other for domestic purposes, a Good Conduct Medal.

Mr. MOULDER. With an honorable discharge for your service.

Mr. STARK. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. I must ask you another question. Were you a member of the party when you were in the armed services?

Mr. STARK. I refuse to answer that question, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. On what grounds?

Mr. STARK. On the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. DOYLE. May I make a very brief observation. I think I as an individual have reason to believe you haven't been in the Communist Party for several years. I am not asking you to—I want to congratulate you on getting out, and I wish the legal situation was such that you could do that which I know you would be glad to do

and therefore officially as a fellow citizen may I urge you to use the great ability you have and the great knowledge you have of how the Communist Party used to operate, use that vigorously and vigilantly, my friend, to overcome the damage done by the Communist Party both past and present.

I kind of have a hunch that you are in a position to contribute much, especially to the education and information of young people of teen age and college age, and help them from the danger of it in any way identifying with the Communist conspiracy. Again I wish the legal situation was different so that you could help us.

Mr. STARK. I appreciate your saying it, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. And I may say although you may have been in the hearing room when my distinguished colleagues, Mr. Moulder and Mr. Scherer said it, but we hope that there will be no reprisal in any way against you as a result of the necessity we have had in calling you before the committee. If there is, I am making a sincere statement, we hope it doesn't occur and if it does, we regret it and will do whatever we properly can to help correct it.

Mr. STARK. Thank you.

Mr. SCHERER. I just want the record to show that in view of his taking the fifth amendment, I can't fully associate myself with your last statement.

Mr. DOYLE. I understand, but it is my statement and I feel that way about it.

Mr. SCHERER. You said "we."

Mr. DOYLE. I am sorry. I will eliminate you but sometimes these things occur and we know a man presently before us as a patriotic citizen entitled to every honest break he can have.

Is there any other question?

Mr. MOULDER. No.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you, witness, and counsel.

(Whereupon the witness was excused.)

Mr. WHEELER. We have one more witness. Mr. Robert Brock.

Mr. BROCK. I have a press statement I would like to give. I will give one to the committee if they want one.

Mr. DOYLE. We will be glad of course to have a press statement, that is issued at the time the witness takes the stand. May I ask you to be sworn.

Mr. BROCK. Surely.

Mr. DOYLE. Do you solemnly swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. BROCK. I do.

TESTIMONY OF ROBERT L. BROCK, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, ARTHUR A. BROOKS

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state your name, please, sir?

Mr. BROCK. Robert L. Brock.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted you are accompanied by counsel. Will counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. BROOKS. I did. Arthur A. Brooks, Jr., of Held & Brooks, Beverly Hills.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Brock?

Mr. BROCK. I was born January 2, 1914, in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you first come to the United States?

Mr. BROCK. This is only what my mother tells me, but it was probably 1915.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a naturalized American citizen or American citizen by birth?

Mr. BROCK. In my opinion I am an American citizen by derivative, however, on my return from Army service at the suggestion of the Immigration Service, in order to take the bar examination I went through the naturalization that was then provided by Congress for servicemen. I think it was early in 1947, at the beginning of 1947 or end of 1946.

Mr. TAVENNER. Your profession, then, is the legal profession?

Mr. BROCK. I am a member of the State bar of the State of California.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your formal educational training has been?

Mr. BROCK. I have lived in Los Angeles since 1920. During that period I attended public and one or two private schools. I went to Hollywood High School from which I graduated in 1930. I went to the University of California at Los Angeles from which I graduated in 1934. I then commenced working for the county and took I think three courses in sociology at the University of Southern California at night school and started then to go to night law school. I completed night law school just before going into the service. Then during my time in service I spent a year's study at the University of California at Berkeley under an Army training program.

Mr. TAVENNER. What year was that?

Mr. BROCK. This is a matter of record, it may not be too accurate, but I think it was 1943 and into 1944. I don't have my service record or I could tell you. It was 1 calendar year. I don't mean calendar year but it was a year's period. That is the extent of my education.

Mr. TAVENNER. What period of time were you in the service?

Mr. BROCK. I went into the service in, I think it was, September of 1942 and was discharged in, I believe, February of 1946. I was in 3½ years.

Mr. TAVENNER. You served overseas?

Mr. BROCK. I served in the China-Burma-India theater.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your employment has been since your return from the service up until the time you began the practice of law.

Mr. BROCK. I went into the service, I got a leave of absence from a civil service position with the county of Los Angeles as a clerk of the superior court.

Mr. TAVENNER. When were you first employed as clerk of the superior court?

Mr. BROCK. I started working for the county of Los Angeles in June 1934, it may be July, when I graduated from UCLA, as a messenger for the county clerk's office at a salary of \$68.18 a month. I continued in that, going through the civil service stages, until I became a court clerk, my recollection is it was probably 1941, and I was still holding that position when I was inducted into the Armed Forces; and

when I came back I resumed that employment and then prepared myself and took the bar examination and became admitted.

Shortly subsequent to my admission I was elected by the judges of the superior court of this county as a superior court commissioner and served in that position until April 1, 1954.

Mr. TAVENNER. Describe briefly the position of commissioner.

Mr. BROCK. A commissioner acts as a sort of referee, ordinarily several commissioners will work in one department under a judge. They hear cases in a manner similar to the manner in which a judge hears them, they make findings and recommendations. Probably in your practice it would be more equivalent to a master in chancery.

I worked almost exclusively in the field of family problems and domestic relations.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long were you so employed?

Mr. BROCK. I started, I think, in September of 1947 and continued until the end of March of 1954.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the reason for the termination of your employment?

Mr. BROCK. I think I explained it in my press release, but I will explain it again. First I wanted to go into private practice, I had never practiced. In the second place, I felt I could be more effective in supporting the Constitution and the Bill of Rights as a practicing attorney than I could on the bench.

Mr. SCHERER. Some of these judges won't like that.

Mr. BROCK. I wasn't sitting as a judge. I was hearing domestic relations cases as commissioner.

Mr. SCHERER. You said you were on the bench.

Mr. BROCK. That is true.

Mr. TAVENNER. In occupying the position of commissioner were you required to give an oath or affidavit required by law?

Mr. BROCK. The law would speak for itself. I rather think so.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you give such an oath?

Mr. BROCK. I do not recall such an oath. If you have a copy of it I would be glad to look at it.

(Document handed to witness.)

Mr. BROCK. I have looked at the document which appears to bear a date in February 1948.

Mr. TAVENNER. At the time of the signing of that document were you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BROCK. I refuse to answer that question on the following grounds: Firstly, I would suggest that if the committee wishes to play fair in the American way, they produce any evidence they may have that I was ever a member of the Communist Party and produce it before a court and not this type of a hearing.

Second ground I have for refusing to answer that question is that it became obvious I think in yesterday's hearing and from Mr. Wereb himself that all of the parties named by Mr. Wereb had been turned in to the FBI and quite apparently the only function served by his testimony here was releasing those names to the press. I do not wish to be a party to this.

I have an answer to isms and I will be glad to give it to the committee if the committee wants it here. I further decline to answer because it is a violation of my rights under the first amendment.

I further decline to answer on the grounds it violates my natural rights because in a democratic form of government the people have an absolute right to free expression and free association.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Tavenner asked you if at the time you signed that document if you were a member of the Communist Party. Did you admit your signature to the document?

Mr. BROCK. I did not.

Mr. MOULDER. I didn't recall any such testimony.

Mr. BROCK. There was not, but if there were, the answer would be the same.

Mr. DOYLE. In view of the witness being an attorney at the California bar and I am also one, I wish to say that my own position as a California lawyer—I haven't practiced for 9 years now—is this: I will fight for your right, Witness, to think what you please and be what you please and do what you please. But I expect you to do this within the four corners of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. BROCK. If you have any other evidence I would like to see it.

Mr. DOYLE. Maybe it will be produced either here or later. I assume it will be.

Mr. SCHERER. The best evidence of nonmembership in the Communist Party on the part of this gentleman would be his sworn testimony here that he is not.

Mr. DOYLE. That is right.

Mr. SCHERER. That is why we are giving him the opportunity.

Mr. BROCK. I didn't ask for any opportunity, Congressman. I am here involuntarily, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I had understood you acknowledged signing the affidavit when you replied to my question, but apparently I misunderstood you.

Mr. BROCK. I think you did, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you sign it?

Mr. BROCK. I refuse to answer that question on the grounds heretofore stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. My question that followed related to whether or not you were a member of the Communist Party at the date of that document, which was in 1948. That was clear, wasn't it?

Mr. BROCK. Yes, sir; that was quite clear.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you ever use the name Bob Lehman?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. BROCK. I refuse to answer that question on the grounds heretofore given.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your address in 1940?

Mr. BROCK. I wish I could tell you. I really don't remember. I think I was living on Verendo Street, but I am not sure.

Mr. TAVENNER. On what other streets did you live, say, between 1935 and 1945?

Mr. BROCK. That is a long period and I can't tell you. I lived for a time on a street called Hicks. I lived for a time at Pasadena at two different addresses. If you want to suggest an address, Mr. Tavenner, I will be glad to answer it. I am not trying to conceal where I live. I don't think it has any bearing on the hearing, but I will be glad to answer it.

Mr. DOYLE. It helps us in identification.

Mr. BROCK. Certainly.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you live at 6010 North——

Mr. BROCK. That sounds familiar.

Mr. TAVENNER. G-r-a-c-i-o-s-o Drive?

Mr. BROCK. Yes; I did some year or other, I am not sure when.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you live there a period of about 10 years?

Mr. BROCK. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you live there?

Mr. BROCK. I couldn't say, but I think probably at one period for about a year during the time right after I got out of college about the time my daughter was born I was living there.

Mr. TAVENNER. That would be about what year?

Mr. BROCK. 1935, I think, and I might have lived there for a few months on some subsequent occasion.

Mr. TAVENNER. You lived there about a year beginning in 1935?

Mr. BROCK. Sometime like that, I am not sure if it was a year or 6 months or 8 months.

Mr. TAVENNER. So then during a part of 1936 that would have been your correct address?

Mr. BROCK. I can't say, but it is possible. I think I probably did for part of the time during 1936. My daughter was born in December 1935 and I think I was there then.

Mr. SCHIERER. Didn't you ask this witness whether he ever used any other name?

Mr. TAVENNER. I asked him whether he had used the name Bob Lehman, L-e-h-m-a-n.

Mr. DOYLE. What was his answer? I don't think he answered it.

Mr. MOULDER. He declined to answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe he refused to answer.

Mr. SCHIERER. He took the fifth amendment.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Brock, you have helped us now on identification of where you lived in answer to these questions, frankly; you have told us you probably lived there and identified the fact that your daughter was born and so forth about that time. Now you have helped us in that matter of identification because if there is any error we don't want to be in error. If there is any error in identification given us as far as you are concerned, we want to know it.

Mr. BROCK. I certainly appreciate it, Congressman.

Mr. DOYLE. You have held high positions. May I say this: If you have used any other name than the one you have given us, why don't you help us in the matter of identification as to name, too? I should think you would be very anxious——

Mr. BROCK. Congressman, it is my sincere view that this committee is doing a real disservice to the Constitution and that is why I am not helping you.

Mr. DOYLE. You helped us on the matter of——

Mr. BROCK. I will help any committee dedicated to preserving civil rights.

Mr. DOYLE. I resent that, Witness, because I think—but again I want to urge, sir, that to me as a member of the bar I would suspect that you ought to in justice to yourself and the bar and the court where you have served these years as commissioner, you ought to help us know who you have been, under what different names if any. I would think you would be interested in that.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Doyle, if you have an opportunity to look at this affidavit that he swore to on February 3, 1948, you would see that he properly invokes the fifth amendment when he refused to answer as to whether or not he ever used the name Lehman, because in this affidavit of course he was under oath, he says he never used any other name. There is a specific provision of this affidavit which says that I never used or have been known by any names other than those listed as follows, so he can't admit here that he used the name of Lehman because he would admit he was guilty of perjury when he signed this affidavit.

Mr. DOYLE. I see.

Mr. SCHERER. So he is properly invoking the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you ever a member of unit A-3 of the Communist Party in Los Angeles?

Mr. BROCK. Sir, I would like to know who accuses me of such membership and what you have to show me that would refresh my memory.

Mr. TAVENNER. I show you a document, a Communist Party document which was obtained by the committee.

Mr. SCHERER. This is the first little bit of evidence he asked for.

Mr. BROCK. May I state for the record in answering the question that this document is entirely typed, bears no signature, starts off "Bob Brock" and under that "Bob Lehman," and right side "1914, unit A-3."

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a moment.

Mr. BROCK (reading):

Clerk, Canadian, joined in '36, proposed by—

and that is all there is on the document, none of which is written in any one's hand. I refuse to answer the question on the grounds heretofore stated.

Mr. SCHERER. I think we should state for the record that his statement is in error because it has been identified under oath as a Communist Party document.

Mr. DOYLE. All he is saying is there is nothing in handwriting.

Mr. SCHERER. I see that.

Mr. BROCK. I didn't hear it identified, Mr. Tavenner, by anyone.

Mr. TAVENNER. No; it has not been identified in this hearing.

Mr. BROCK. I guess Mr. Scherer is in error.

Mr. SCHERER. Not in this hearing.

Mr. BROCK. Has it been identified at any hearing?

Mr. TAVENNER. It has not been identified at a hearing.

Mr. DOYLE. It has been identified, whether at a hearing or not.

Mr. TAVENNER. It has been identified.

Mr. BROCK. By whom?

Mr. DOYLE. I know it has been identified, I assure you, but not in a public hearing. We wouldn't put a document in front of you that hasn't been identified to our satisfaction, even if not in a hearing.

Mr. BROCK. Under committee rules I am entitled to be apprised of any evidence in a prior hearing involving me and I have not been so advised.

Mr. DOYLE. No such committee rule, you know that, but I assure you we don't present a document under your eyes that hasn't been identified as such in the judgment of our distinguished legal counsel as sufficient identification of a Communist Party record for your information in answers.

Mr. TAVENNER. You read the year 1914. That was the date of your birth, was it not?

Mr. BROCK. Part of the date, January 1, 1914; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. You read the address, 6010 North Gracioso Drive. That was your residence in 1936, wasn't it?

Mr. BROCK. I can't say for how long in 1936 but it was I think for part of 1936.

Mr. TAVENNER. You read the employment as clerk. You were a clerk, were you not?

Mr. BROCK. I was either a clerk or messenger at that time, I am not sure which.

Mr. TAVENNER. You read the name Canadian, did you not?

Mr. BROCK. The word Canadian, that is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. And you were born in Canada, weren't you?

Mr. BROCK. I was, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. You read the name Bob Lehman?

Mr. BROCK. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you ever use that name?

Mr. BROCK. I am sure you asked me that question and I have already declined to answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you still decline to answer it after reading it from this card?

Mr. BROCK. Yes, sir; I do.

Mr. TAVENNER. On what grounds?

Mr. BROCK. On the grounds heretofore stated at the time of your last question.

Mr. TAVENNER. You read "joined in 1936." Did you join the Communist Party in 1936?

Mr. BROCK. I think I have already declined to answer that question, too.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have not asked you that.

Mr. BROCK. I thought you had. I am sorry. I will decline to answer that question on the grounds heretofore stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you questioned at the time that you terminated the position of commissioner, or shortly prior thereto, regarding Communist Party membership?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. BROCK. I will decline to answer that question on the same grounds heretofore given.

Mr. SCHERER. I want to interrupt now because it is very important. The statement this man gave to the press before he sat down on this witness stand says that one of his most compelling reasons for his resignation from the bench "Was my desire to work more effectively against the un-American hysteria and fear generated by this and like committees."

Now he takes the fifth amendment when he is asked about the circumstances surrounding that resignation. I can readily believe now that this is not so.

Mr. BROCK. Why don't you call the judges and ask them?

Mr. SCHERER. We have you here now.

Mr. DOYLE. My former law partner of 20 years is on the superior bench of Los Angeles County, Hon. George G. Clark. I think I will ask him.

Mr. BROCK. I would welcome it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you interviewed by the personnel committee of the superior court regarding this subject, the subject of your alleged Communist Party membership?

Mr. BROCK. I refuse to answer that question on the grounds heretofore stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Weren't you required to resign?

Mr. BROCK. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Didn't you resign because of the situation which I have mentioned?

Mr. BROCK. No, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. How soon after you were questioned about your Communist Party activities did you resign?

Mr. BROCK. I am sure, Mr. Scherer, you are not trying to trick me into an answer to a question to which I claimed my constitutional rights. Therefore, I will decline to discuss this on the same grounds.

Mr. DOYLE. Let me ask you this in all sincerity: Were you a member of the Communist Party at the time you resigned?

Mr. BROCK. I will decline to answer that question on the same grounds, sir. I might state with all deference to the committee, if I may be given leave, it has been my practice for many years to associate myself with whatever people I wish to pursue, objectives which I consider to be proper, to sign anything I wish if I agree with it, regardless of who put it out, and this is a practice I will continue. I will not discuss organization or people with this committee.

If I had at any time any evidence of any unlawful activity, sabotage, or espionage, I would turn that evidence over to the FBI where it belongs.

Mr. TAVENNER. May I ask you this: What was the date of your resignation?

Mr. BROCK. It was sent in some time before it took effect. My present recollection is it was effective the end of March of 1954.

Mr. TAVENNER. It was April 2, 1954, was it not?

Mr. BROCK. I am not sure. If you say so that could be true.

Mr. TAVENNER. Weren't you interviewed by the personnel committee of the superior court on the 29th day of March 1954 just a few days prior to your resignation?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. BROCK. Not according to my recollection, sir. In fact, I was never interviewed by the personnel committee of the superior court except when I was employed.

Mr. TAVENNER. By whom were you interviewed regarding alleged Communist Party activity prior to your resignation?

Mr. BROCK. I have already declined to answer that question, sir, and I will continue to do so.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. BROCK. I am not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party at January 1, 1955?

Mr. BROCK. Please, sir, do not try to fence with me. I have told you I am not going to give you information of that type.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am going to put you on oath, sir, as to the time you left the Communist Party and if you refuse to answer that is your refusal.

Mr. BROCK. I shall do that, sir, consistently to the rest of your questions on that subject.

Mr. DOYLE. You volunteered you were not a member of the Communist Party at this minute. Excuse me for interrupting.

Mr. SCHERER. Were you a member of the Communist Party yesterday?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. BROCK. My answer will be the same to that as I have just indicated to Mr. Tavenner, Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHERER. You mean you are refusing to answer on the basis of the fifth amendment?

Mr. BROCK. I am refusing to answer that question on the grounds as follows: First, that this committee is violating my natural rights; second, the committee is not pursuing its proper legislative purpose; thirdly, on the grounds that I have rights not to answer as to my associations under the first amendment; and, fourthly, the first amendment supplemented by the fifth amendment, in that I do not choose to be a witness against myself.

Mr. SCHERER. You refused to answer as to whether you were a member of the Communist Party yesterday. Were you a member of the Communist Party when you came here this morning?

Mr. BROCK. Would it be satisfactory, sir, if I just incorporated my last refusal?

Mr. DOYLE. Very satisfactory.

Mr. BROCK. I will do that right along if you wish.

Mr. DOYLE. It is in order to save time, but not because we accept it as sufficient, I assure you.

Mr. SCHERER. Let's get this straight. He is under oath now and I am going to ask whether or not the statements you made in this release to the press before you got on the stand are true, all of them true, every one of them.

(Witness read his own statement.)

Mr. DOYLE. Let the witness read the statement.

Mr. SCHERER. Just a minute.

Mr. BROCK. You don't mind if I read my copy?

Mr. SCHERER. I hope you wrote it.

Mr. BROCK. I did. Every statement I have made in this press release is unequivocally true.

Mr. SCHERER. All right. You still say that the chief reason for resigning from the bench, as you put it, was because of your desire to work more effectively against this committee.

Mr. BROCK. Yes, sir; I do so state that.

Mr. SCHERER. All right.

Mr. BROCK. And I want it understood I do not mean this committee as individuals. I have no personal feeling against the members of this committee. I feel what you are doing is wrong.

Mr. SCHERER. You say that was your reason for resigning from the bench?

Mr. BROCK. I said that was one of my most compelling reasons for resigning from the bench.

Mr. SCHERER. What were the other reasons?

Mr. BROCK. I wanted to go into private practice of law.

Mr. SCHERER. Are those the only two reasons?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. BROCK. I felt also that my activities in connection with civil liberties issues might be a source of embarrassment to the courts and I have always held the courts in high respect and I did not wish to be a source of any controversy.

Excuse me, sir. May I state something to supplement that answer? I was already in the process of involving myself in what I considered to be one of the crucial civil liberties cases in this day and I wished to resign to devote myself to it.

Mr. SCHERER. Did your association in Communist Party activities have anything to do with your resignation from the bench?

Mr. BROCK. No.

Mr. SCHERER. Not at all?

Mr. BROCK. No.

Mr. SCHERER. Did the fact that you had signed an affidavit—

Mr. MOULDER. I believe that question is a presumption you were a member or associated with Communist activities.

Mr. BROCK. If it does, I didn't so understand it or so intend the answer.

Mr. SCHERER. Were you a member of the Communist Party at the time you resigned from the bench?

Mr. BROCK. I have already declined to answer that question and all similar questions.

Mr. SCHERER. Now let's get one more thing. Did the fact that you signed an affidavit under oath on February 3, 1948, when you obtained your position with the superior court, in which affidavit you swore that you had never used any other name than Robert L. Broughton have anything to do with your resignation?

Mr. BROCK. I might say the name Robert L. Broughton is the name under which I was born.

Mr. SCHERER. I understand that.

Mr. BROCK. I must decline to answer the question on the grounds heretofore given.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you tell the truth when you swore to this affidavit on February 3, 1948, when you obtained your job in the Superior court?

Mr. BROCK. I refuse to answer the question on the grounds heretofore stated.

Mr. SCHERER. You mean as a member of this bar that you are refusing to tell his committee, sir, whether or not you told the truth when you signed an affidavit under oath for a position with the court of this county?

Mr. BROCK. I refuse to answer the question on the grounds heretofore stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, the affidavit should be introduced in evidence and I request that it be marked "Brock Exhibit No. 1," for identification and retained in the committee files.

Mr. DOYLE. It will be so received and so marked.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Chairman. I hate to delay the proceedings at the closing of the hearings, but could the reporter go back and read the question which Mr. Scherer asked, which was in substance "Did your affiliation or association with the Communist Party influence

your resignation as a commissioner of the court?" I would like to have that question read, and the answer.

(The reporter read from his notes as follows:)

Mr. SCHERER. Did your association in Communist Party activities have anything to do with your resignation from the bench?

Mr. BROCK. No.

Mr. MOULDER. What was the answer?

Mr. BROCK. The answer was "No." I can tell you, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. I have another question. At the time you resigned did you make any public statement as to the reasons for your resignation?

Mr. BROCK. I don't think so.

Mr. SCHERER. Wasn't there an article in the press about your resignation?

Mr. BROCK. I don't think so. I think there probably was an article in the legal paper that I was going to private practice.

Mr. SCHERER. And there was no statement that you made at that time as to why you were resigning?

Mr. BROCK. If it was I don't remember it. Oh, I think so. I think I said I was resigning to go into private practice. I will look at it if you will show it to me.

Mr. SCHERER. That is right. Did you give any other reasons at that time to the press for your resignation?

Mr. BROCK. If you have the article, the fair thing would be to let me see it. This is a matter of a year and a half ago and I am sure you don't want to be unfair.

Mr. SCHERER. No; I don't want to be unfair.

Mr. DOYLE. A year and a half isn't very long.

Mr. BROCK. Quite long to remember a newspaper article.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you give any reasons when you resigned other than that you wanted to go into the private practice of law?

Mr. BROCK. You mean in a newspaper article?

Mr. SCHERER. Yes.

Mr. BROCK. Show me the article and I will tell you. It will speak for itself. I don't think I did.

Mr. SCHERER. That is all I want to know because I don't have such an article. You never did say at any time when you resigned that the reasons, the most compelling reason that you were resigning was to fight this committee? Have you ever made that statement prior to the time you prepared this memorandum for the press here today?

Mr. BROCK. Do you mean in the form of a press release, sir?

Mr. SCHERER. Any time. Did you ever make such a statement?

Mr. BROCK. I have made it many times, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. You never made such a statement at the time you left the bench?

Mr. BROCK. To individuals; yes.

Mr. DOYLE. You volunteered the statement that you made this charge against this committee many times. I think in view of your volunteering that statement I am entitled to ask you where you made that statement in public.

Mr. BROCK. You may be entitled to ask me, sir, but I won't answer it on the grounds heretofore given.

Mr. DOYLE. I think you have waived your privilege you might have had and the answer is not satisfactory and I instruct you to answer.

Mr. BROCK. I have made that statement to my wife and friends and other people.

Mr. DOYLE. Any public meeting ever?

Mr. BROCK. If so, I don't recall it.

Mr. DOYLE. You don't recall it. You have made it in private but not in a public meeting?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. BROCK. I may have made it from the platform when I resigned from the board of education. I am not sure. I have made it of this committee on more than one occasion.

Mr. DOYLE. No, I am not sure of it. I am not sure you ever criticized this committee in public.

You are a member of the California bar and so am I. You made a charge here that I know is basically on a false premise, that is the way I will put it. I will dignify it that way, although it is kind of hard to do it, to give it any dignity, but you are a member of the bar and you are under oath. Here is what you said, it is clear. I charge that "this committee is attempting to punish me solely because of my strenuous opposition to all the committee stands for."

We are here as American Congressmen under Public Law 601. We are here performing our official duty, which official duty by the way has been assigned us from time to time by overwhelming vote of the House of Representatives, overwhelming votes. Two votes against this committee in the House, that is all, out of 464 or 465 and none this last year. The House of Representatives unanimously approving our functioning as we are. Now I want to say to you that as a member of this committee I would not have shared in any attempt to punish you because you attacked this committee, but we have documentary evidence and testimony under oath on occasions that you were a member of the Communist Party, and we have presented some of it here and you have pleaded your constitutional privilege. I merely want the record to show and the press to know, that this charge by you is based on absolutely a false premise, this committee did not come to California to take your time or its time to bring you in merely because you attacked the committee.

In fact, you can't identify a single time when you attacked this committee in public. That is why I asked you that question.

Mr. SCHERER. Until after he was subpoenaed.

Mr. DOYLE. After he was subpoenaed. That is why I asked you that question. What knowledge did we have of you criticizing this committee? We had no knowledge in that sense. It is a facetious and false claim on your part and I am disappointed to find you making it.

Mr. SCHERER. I never knew this man existed until he took the stand.

Mr. DOYLE. You are here now telling us for press release purposes that we are punishing you because of your strenuous opposition to all the committee stands for. We never heard of you criticizing the committee any place. We did hear of you as a Communist Party member and you know it.

Mr. BROCK. From whom, Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. The document here which has been identified. You don't even have it—

Mr. SCHERER. He doesn't deny that.

Mr. DOYLE. I won't enter into that. At any rate I gave you the opportunity to testify as to a single meeting where you criticized the

committee in public and you say you have done it in private only, as far as you know.

How do you expect me or anybody in this room or anyone else to believe your sincerity in that charge? It is false.

Mr. SCHERER. That is the reason I asked him under oath whether the statements here are true. He is going to have a hard time proving that statement.

Mr. MOULDER. Is the commissioner of the county court an elective or an appointive office?

Mr. BROCK. The practice here, sir, it is elected by the judges, not elected by the people.

Mr. MOULDER. I recall again the question which I asked the reporter to read a while ago which was in substance: Did your association with the Communist Party have anything to do with your resignation? That question was propounded to you by Congressman Scherer. It carries with it the implication on one construction that you are denying that you ever associated with the Communist Party. It also carries a strong implication as to a double-barreled answer that you were associated with the Communist Party, but it had nothing to do with your resignation.

I am wondering whether or not you want to clarify the conflict in the two constructions that can be made from that question and answer.

Mr. BROCK. Was the question about my running for office or resigning? It slipped me. It was a question about my resignation? The Communist Party so far as I know had nothing to do with my resignation. I have never taken orders from the Communist Party or anyone else.

Mr. SCHERER. That wasn't my question. If you understand my question to be that then you misunderstood my question. My question was whether or not the questioning of you by officials connected either directly or indirectly with the superior court here about your Communist Party activities had anything to do with your resignation. That was my question. I didn't ask whether the Communist Party had anything to do with your resignation. Obviously they would want to keep you on the bench.

Mr. BROCK. The question is whether the questioning of me by public officials had anything to do with my resignation.

Mr. SCHERER. By anyone shortly before you retired?

Mr. BROCK. The answer is I have not admitted being questioned, sir. You have assumed it. The answer to the question is that I have already given you my reasons for resigning.

Mr. SCHERER. Will you answer my question, whether or not the questioning of you by any officials connected with the Superior Court either directly or indirectly by the FBI or anyone else had anything to do with your resigning a few days later?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. SCHERER. You may have had other reasons you say but I want to know whether that had anything to do with your resigning.

Mr. BROCK. Insofar as the question contains some implication that there was a questioning—and I have already claimed the privilege as to that—I must claim it again as to this question.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Moulder?

Mr. MOULDER. No questions.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. I have no further questions.

Mr. DOYLE. I hope if you did join the Communist Party—I am not inferring you did, for the purpose of this question, but if you ever did join it, sir, why don't you turn tables on whatever activity you have shared in the Communist Party and give the benefit to your Nation of your ability in the upholding of law?

This is Public Law 601 under which we are here operating. Why don't you give your Nation the benefit of upholding every declared law? You are not doing it as I see it. One statement here, one attack you have made upon this committee is the——

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Doyle, it has not been my intention to attack the committee on a personal level, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. I understand that, and I don't know of any reason why you could attack us on an individual, personal level, because we are all members of the bar; Mr. Moulder, a distinguished member of the bar of Missouri; Mr. Scherer of the State of Ohio; and I supported myself honorably in California law practice for 30 years. Now where you refer to the decision of the Emspak case—and you base your attack on the committee activities in part on the Emspak decision—I say to you right here so you will understand, that the Emspak decision does not go to the point that you say it goes to in this press release.

It does not go that far and again you are on a false premise, absolutely false.

Here you are saying that the Chief Justice, former Governor of this State, Earl Warren, charged, or in the Emspak case indicated that this committee operated in a "highly immoral invasion of man's natural rights." And it is false.

Mr. BROCK. Read the question, sir. You will see that statement refers to the earlier part of the sentence. You have read it incorrectly.

Mr. DOYLE. It is in there. You may give it a technical explanation if you can, but for the purpose of the reading of the press they would think that Earl Warren charged us with immoral conduct.

Mr. BROCK. Off the record now, I didn't mean to charge that.

Mr. DOYLE. You had better correct it.

Mr. BROCK. I alone charged you with that.

Mr. DOYLE. Thank you, Witness, and Counsel.

(Whereupon the witness was excused.)

Mr. DOYLE. May I say it is customary for the chairman of the committee at the conclusion of a hearing to make a statement, some observations about the hearing, perhaps, and some impressions we get, some conclusions we draw, and so I have written out here just more or less extemporaneously—a statement which I want to read in part.

Upon conclusion of these week-long hearings in this area, this subcommittee of the House Un-American Activities Committee wishes to express its appreciation to all government agencies and public officials in this very important metropolitan area who have been helpful and cooperative in assuring the expeditious conduct in the business of the committee.

In fact, every time we come to the Los Angeles area we always receive this same gracious and helpful cooperation from all public officials and agencies.

This subcommittee and its staff are appreciative of the fine standard of public service rendered by all these men and ladies in the execution of their duties.

United States Marshal Robert Ware of Los Angeles County, Sheriff Eugene W. Biscailuz and his deputies and assistants have rendered valuable assistance and cooperation, as has Chief William Parker of the Los Angeles Police Department and all officers under his command.

Mayor Poulson and his assistants and United States Attorney Laughlin Waters, have all been helpful with their staffs.

Now, I am glad that I was able to get the names of the individual deputies of the United States Marshal's office and the Sheriff's office because they certainly have been very cooperative and helpful. They are here this morning when they might otherwise be off. They are Deputy United States Marshals Charles W. Ross, Edward R. Freeman and John E. Sears.

Deputy Sheriffs Bert Caughey, Clarence Steinberg, Don Simpson, Ralph Chervy, Galen Nichols, Charles Gilleland.

Mr. Stillwell, superintendent of Federal employees in this building, rendered valuable assistance to the committee. I would feel derelict if I did not express a special word of appreciation in this regard to Mr. Stillwell and his associates because this is a repetition of many other courtesies when we have been here before. The ultimate success of any hearing is dependent upon the adequacy of coverage, both news and photography. In this respect the present hearing has been outstanding. To the representatives of all the news media covering the hearings this week, the committee extends its thanks and I have heard nothing but commendation of the press and the manner in which they have so accurately reported these hearings.

While it is too early to evaluate fully the mass of testimony taken during the course of the hearings, the committee is satisfied it has received very important and valuable information, all of which will help enable this committee of Congress to fulfill its obligation to the Congress under the terms of Public Law 601, which specifically charges this committee of only nine members, to investigate the extent and character and objectives of subversive activities throughout our great Nation, whether this subversive propaganda activity emanates from some foreign country or from within our own borders.

In these present hearings we have again made it clear that we are determined to investigate and expose subversive activity or subversive propaganda wherever it shows its ugly head.

Our excellent investigative staff always does a very accurate field job before we ever arrive in a city to conduct public hearings.

It is our duty to look into the extent of subversive activity and the extent to which the Communist Party subversive program, or any other subversive program, controls or infiltrates, wherever this trail is found, to lead us in sufficient quantity to be material and within our ability to substantiate by competent evidence.

Evidence clearly shows that the Communist Party began some time ago to systematically infiltrate both political parties in California. We urge the responsible leaders of these two major political parties in California to be extremely vigilant to protect against this deliberate

attempt to weaken the sincere, patriotic expression of political patriotism through the channels of both the major parties.

The clear evidence we have received under oath shows that the Independent Progressive Party is likely so heavy with Communist Party persons that it became in many places an effective tool of the Communist Party. The Independent Progressive Party in California did not qualify, I am informed, legally as a legal party in California. We believe we are reliably informed that many former members, many present members of the Communist Party to all intents and purposes are recently undertaking to join the Democratic and Republican Parties in Los Angeles County and throughout the State.

To the extent to which the Communists identified with the Independent Progressive Party during its legal existence and still remain Communists in intent and purpose and interests and objectives, such persons joining either of patriotic major political parties would therefore infiltrate with continued subversive intent, which is always to disrupt, always to cause confusion and always to cause dissatisfaction in any group in which they infiltrate.

Two patriotic American citizens who entered the confidential service of the FBI for several years and who appeared as witnesses before this committee have, of course, been by some of the witnesses called stool pigeons and paid informers—that is, by some of the witnesses here who have pleaded the fifth amendment.

The committee states that it approves the use of the fifth amendment or any constitutional privilege wherever this witness does so honestly and in good faith with the United States Constitution, but we abhor—and so do you if you are patriotic Americans—the use of it dishonestly and in bad faith.

We also know it is still the continued Communist Party line to have their former or present members of the Communist Party always plead their constitutional privilege, whether it is in rotten faith or in good faith, even if it is dishonest, to avoid having this committee obtain as much information as possible.

We thank the former FBI agents who appeared before this committee in these hearings and were so helpful in this hearing in Los Angeles, as in other large cities; also witnesses who were formerly Communist Party members in Los Angeles and in the Los Angeles area and without subpoena have cooperated with the committee on the witness stand.

These have not been paid witnesses, nor paid informers, nor stool pigeons, but are American citizens who have heretofore withdrawn from the Communist Party because they got their fill of Communist garbage and on account of discovering it had no place in their lives or in the life of our Nation and on account of becoming disgusted with it or discovering its totalitarian and subversive purposes.

So these individuals who have cooperated with the committee came to realize that it was their bounden public duty to their native country to cooperate with this committee and help it expose wherever the Communist Party had control or infiltrated any group.

We now again invite any other former Communist Party member or present Communist Party member who has arrived at the same point at which these cooperative witnesses have arrived, to also make known their desire to help their Nation and come forward and let us

hear from them so that we can cooperate with them and they with us and further expose the conspiracy.

During these hearings, as chairman I have publicly announced that this committee had a standing invitation to any person who was named as a Communist Party member by any witness before this committee under oath to voluntarily come forward before the committee and take the oath and deny or affirm as to the testimony in which they had been named as Communist Party members.

We renew that standing invitation.

Also in this hearing room when it occurred that a witness named a person who happened to be in the hearing room at the same time, and who heard himself named as a Communist Party member, there was again announced our standing invitation to such person so named to come forward and take the oath, the same oath, and either deny or affirm what the witness under oath had said about him. In these hearings no such person has come forward, either directly or indirectly.

In these hearings very few witnesses from the field of labor have stated that this committee was injuring labor. We repeat that this committee has not and will not fail to refuse to investigate subversive Communist Party activities in any area merely because it happens to be in some particular area of American activity, whether it is in labor or law or any other.

We note that the Communist Party has definitely sought to control patriotic American labor. We congratulate patriotic labor organization on their vigorous steps already taken to eradicate Communist individuals or Communist Party activities and their continuing to do it. We compliment them.

Again in this hearing, as in many areas throughout the United States, the uncontradicted testimony of witnesses we believe reliable, is that the Communist Party in the United States has as its ultimate aim the forceful overthrow of our constitutional form of government in favor of totalitarian Communist Party control as is in control in the Soviet Union.

This committee in a few days goes to San Diego for a few days' work there similar to that here in performance of our public duty and we then return to our official duties at the Nation's Capital.

I want to thank the audience, you folks that have sat here from day to day, or 1 day, or an hour, outside of too few incidents to be mentioned or emphasized, I want to say that I am sure we members of the committee and staff all appreciate the understanding and cooperation of most everyone who has ever been present as our guests in this room.

If there is nothing further, counsel and members, the committee stands adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 1:10 p. m., July 2, 1955, the committee was recessed subject to call.)

INDEX

INDIVIDUALS

	Page
Adams, Charlotte Darling	1541
Adams, Steve	1805
Aidlin, Joseph W.	1753, 1754, 1771-1778 (testimony)
Alexander, Hershel	1827, 1857
Alexander, Lillian (Mrs. Hershel Alexander)	1857
Appelman, Max	1768-1771 (testimony)
Ashe, Harold	1754, 1771
Averbuck, Elmer	1817
Avery, John B.	1680
Baker, Nettie (Eddie)	1857
Baldo, John	1796
Bargeman, Bert. (See Bowerman, Irene B.)	
Baron, Beatrice (Bea)	1815
Baron, Lou	1815
Barry, Clemmie	1461
Beard, Cecil	1538-1543 (testimony)
Belt, Dave	1802
Bennett, Harry	1819
Bennett, Sophia (Mrs. Harry Bennett)	1819
Bennick, Rose Mary	1805
Benoitte, Charlotte	1819
Bilan, Anne	1826
Biluk, John	1805
Blair, Bud	1815, 1820
Blair, Mrs. Bud	1819
Blowitz, William	1575
Bodner, Ed	1804
Bowerman, Irene B. (formerly Bertha Bargeman)	1689-1696 (testimony)
Boylan, Tom	1461
Brant, Carl	1747, 1819-1822
Brock, Robert L. (born Robert L. Broughton)	1889-1902 (testimony)
Brodsky, Merle	1817
Bronton, Leon, Jr.	1827
Brooks, Arthur A.	1889
Brooks, Miriam	1815
Broughton, Robert L. (See Robert L. Brock.)	
Browder, Earl	1484
Brown, Archie	1461, 1822
Bryan, Al	1769
Buchanan, Harry	1738
Buchman, Sidney	1485
Burford, James (also known as Ron Hillyer)	1754, 1827-1836 (testimony)
Burton, Anne. (See Pollock, Anne.)	
Cain, Cary	1805
Callahan, Charlotte	1461
Cantu, Alice	1805
Cantu, Wayne	1805
Carl, C. C. (See Sugar, Carl.)	
Cerney, Isobel	1517
Chemiel, Stanley	1811
Chernick, Ann	1856
Chernin, Rose	1517, 1822

	Page
Chriss, Dave.....	1802, 1815
Chriss, Gene.....	1802
Chriss, Jean.....	1815
Chriss, Sally (Mrs. Gene Chriss).....	1802, 1817
Chriss, Sam.....	1788
Christiansen, Mel.....	1805
Clark, Leo.....	1805
Clarke, Angela (married name Angela Wilkerson).....	1523-1538 (testimony)
Cline, Paul.....	1733, 1769, 1813
Coffee, Bert.....	1801, 1849
Colton, Araby.....	1805
Colton, Victor.....	1805
Connelly, Philip.....	1821, 1822
Daggett, Charles.....	1773
Davis, Frank C.....	1616, 1679-1688 (testimony), 1758
Davis, Gorham.....	1699
Deinum, Andries.....	1474-1498 (testimony)
DeMaio, Ernest.....	1607-1609
Dexter, Edith.....	1805
Dexter, Mansell.....	1805
Dixon, James.....	1856
Dobbs, Ben.....	1822
Doyle, Bernadette.....	1509, 1517
Durant, Ray.....	1814
Elconin, Alice.....	1804
Elconin, William.....	1713-1731 (testimony)
Emery, Louis.....	1805
Engelberg, Hy.....	1822
Esterman, William B.....	1572-1575
Evans, Herb.....	1805
Evans, Ruth (Mrs. Herb Evans).....	1805
Farmer, Virginia.....	1747, 1748
Fast, Howard.....	1609
Fein, Adrienne.....	1788, 1802
Fein, Chester.....	1788, 1815
Fisher, Ed.....	1810
Fisher, Onya.....	1810
Fitzgerald, Ed.....	1788, 1796
Flynn, Elizabeth Gurley.....	1822
Forrest, Jim.....	1822
Franchi, Davida.....	1744
Franchi, Fred.....	1748
Freed, Emil.....	1517, 1815
Freed, Tasia.....	1752, 1764-1767 (testimony), 1840-1842
Frieden, Mayer.....	1791
Frong, Barney.....	1802, 1804
Frong, Lillian.....	1788, 1796, 1802
Fujimoto, Sam.....	1805
Gardner, Helen.....	1769
Garrish, Georgiana (Mrs. John Garrish).....	1782-1784, 1810
Garrish, Henry.....	1810
Garrish, John.....	1782-1784, 1810
Garrish, Laura R.....	1810
Garlin, Sender.....	1503
Gibson, Howard.....	1503
Gibson, Lolita.....	1500, 1501, 1503
Ginsberg, Leon.....	1822
Gladstone, Charles (also known as Charles Young).....	1826
Glass, David B.....	1803
Glenn, Elizabeth Leich.....	1787, 1788, 1790, 1792, 1815
Gojack, John T.....	1607-1609
Goldman, Florence.....	1805
Goldman, Irving.....	1826
Goldstein, Beebe.....	1815
Goldstein, Butb.....	1813
Good, Jack.....	1802

	Page
Gordon, Emily	1785, 1786, 1812
Gorman, Mike	1787, 1788, 1796, 1799, 1811, 1815
Gray, Shirley	1822
Hagen, Edwin	1796, 1797, 1799, 1801, 1856
Hard, Martha. (<i>See Wheeldin, Martha.</i>)	
Hardyman, Hugh (full name George Hugh Murray Maitland Hardyman)	1504, 1575-1598 (testimony), 1599-1655 (testimony), 1609, 1674
Hardyman, Susan	1661
Harris, Lew	1666
Harrison, William	1609
Hart, Marion	1804
Hawks, George	1805
Hay, Harry	1790, 1791, 1796, 1872-1875 (testimony)
Healy, Don	1803, 1804, 1826
Healy, Dorothy	1797, 1804, 1813, 1816, 1823-1826
Helgren, George	1757
Helgren, Nora (Mrs. George Helgren)	1756
Hillyer, Ron. (<i>See Jim Burford.</i>)	
Hollingshead, Ed	1827
Houdeck, Cliff	1827
Houston, Gladys (Mrs. John Houston)	1810
Houston, John Waters	1783-1785, 1788, 1794, 1796, 1798, 1804, 1810, 1812, 1849, 1860-1872 (testimony)
Hwan, Lee Tuk	1557
Hyun, Alice	1502, 1553, 1556
Hyun, David	1520
Hyun, Peter	1501-1506 1508, 1509, 1512-1514, 1516, 1570, 1574, 1592, 1593, 1611, 1750
Hyun, Peter S., Sr.	1706
Irvine, Ray	1461
Jelte, George	1685
Johnson, Mickey	1801
Johnson, Olaf	1802
Johnson, Pete	1811
Kadish, Frank	1822
Kang, Kim. (<i>See Kim, Diamond.</i>)	
Karson, Charles	1809
Karson, Ida (Mrs. Jack Karson)	1788, 1802
Karson, Jack	1788, 1796, 1798, 1799, 1809, 1813
Karson, Morris	1809
Katz, Charles J.	1667
Kellas, William	1787, 1789, 1798
Kelly, Earl	1801
Kemer, William	1501
Kennard, J. Spencer, Jr.	1609
Kenny, Robert	1474, 1523, 1538, 1676, 1679, 1761, 1882
Kent, Rockwell	1609
Kibre, Jeff	1744
Kiloran, Pat	1822
Kim, Diamond (also known as Kim Kang)	1516, 1543-1572 (testimony)
Kimble, William (also known as William Ward and William Wallace)	1458, 1469, 1731-1761 (testimony), 1773-1775, 1841
Kingsbury, John A.	1503, 1505, 1510-1514, 1591, 1592
Kingsbury, John W.	1601
Kingsbury, Mabel (Mrs. John A. Kingsbury)	1505, 1513, 1514
Konigsberg, Raphael	1601, 1612, 1613, 1615, 1655, 1656-1666 (testimony)
Korn, Eva	1822
Korngold, Morrey	1802, 1804
Korngold, Rochelle (Mrs. Morrey Korngold)	1802, 1804
Kramer, Jerry (Jack)	1803, 1811
Kuchler, Alfred	1609
Kutnick, Sam	1463
Kykyri, Dorothy (Mrs. John Kykyri)	1517, 1518
Kykyri, John	1517, 1518
Kyung Sun. (<i>See Lee, Sa Min.</i>)	
Lambert, Rudy (or Rudie)	1461, 1822

	Page
Langer, Verna	1504, 1506, 1517
Lardner, Ring, Jr.	1813, 1822
Lavino, Ernest	1461
Lawson, John Howard	1485, 1786
Lawson, Sue	1572-1575 (testimony), 1833
Lee, Sa Min (also known as Kyung Sun)	1551-1553, 1556, 1558
Lehman, Bob	1893, 1895
Lehr, Wenzel	1805
Leiva, Gerda	1805
Lima, Albert	1822
Lindbergh, Virginia	1461
Lohr, George	1822
Love, Rudy	1803
Lovett, Robert Morss	1609
Lynn, Frances	1817
Maddox, Edward Carter	1875
Maise, Wilhelmina	1782, 1815
Mancar, Elsie	1803, 1804, 1820
Margolis, Ben	1689, 1707
Marshall, Daniel G.	1668, 1676, 1679, 1844, 1845, 1848
Massey, Henry	1461
Matusow, Harvey	1709
McComb, Dan	1790, 1796, 1798, 1799, 1815
McComb, Eleanor (or Ellen; Mrs. Dan McComb)	1796, 1803
McCord, Louise	1816
McCormick, Larue	1826, 1827
McGenty, Naomi	1747
McNeil, Jackie	1461
Meyer, Margaret Vaughn (nee Vaughn)	1806, 1844-1849 (testimony)
Min, Lee Sa	1560
Monjar, Elsie	1794, 1856, 1865
Moos, Elizabeth	1503-1506
Morford, Richard	1504, 1505, 1507
Morley, Barbara	1817
Morley, Karen	1607-1609
Morrison, Philip	1609
Moss, Jack	1823
Mucha, Reva	1505, 1507, 1516
Musick, Laura Lee	1796, 1797, 1803, 1804
Natapoff, Max Benjamin (also known as Max Roth)	1751, 1761-1764 (testimony)
Nester, Fletcher	1823
Nester, Sophie	1823
Norfjor, Helen	1815
O'Neil, Bill	1815
Oppenheimer, Frank	1698
Orr, Paul Wright	1440-1473 (testimony)
Orr, Violet (Mrs. Paul Orr)	1461, 1463
Ostreimer, Ken	1817
Osvald, Clara (Mrs. William Kimple)	1745
Pacifico, Lawrence	1802
Pacifico, Ola	1798, 1799, 1817
Paolone, Clementina J.	1609
Parrett, Bronson	1794, 1795, 1809
Parrett, Fern (Mrs. Bronson Parrett)	1794, 1795, 1803, 1804
Patton, Jack	1461
Pekstan, Carl	1805
Pelman, Matt (Mat)	1749, 1750, 1769
Perry, Pettis	1769, 1817
Pestana, Frank	1872
Phieffer, Frank	1805
Pinkston, Earl	1805
Pittman, John	1461
Pollock, Anne (also known as Anne Burton)	1752, 1765, 1766, 1826, 1836-1844 (testimony)
Potter, Eleanor	1809

	Page
Potter, Vernon L.....	1780, 1782, 1783, 1788, 1796, 1799, 1809
Prater, William.....	1451
Prokel.....	1699
Pyen, Choon Ho.....	1549, 1551, 1553, 1556, 1558
Raiden, Mary (Mrs. Joseph Aidlin).....	1753, 1754, 1773
Rankin, Mary. (See Taylor, Ellen.)	
Ransom, Willard.....	1609
Remington, William.....	1503, 1504
Resner, Herbert.....	1461
Richardson, Thomas.....	1609
Richman, Ben.....	1817, 1818
Richmond, Al.....	1817, 1818
Roberts, Harold.....	1815
Robeson, Paul.....	1510
Robinson, Marguerite.....	1517
Rosenberg, Meta Reis.....	1575
Rossen, Robert.....	1484, 1485
Rosser, Lou.....	1796
Roth, Max. (See Natapoff, Max Benjamin.)	
Ruso, Pat.....	1802
Russell, Maud.....	1505
Samuels, William.....	1548
Sandy, George.....	1791, 1792, 1816, 1817
Sazer, Ester Miller.....	1817
Schlesinger, Tess.....	1755
Schmidt, Judy.....	1818
Schneider, Anita Bell.....	1498-1521 (testimony), 1568, 1569, 1620
Schneiderman, William.....	1700, 1750, 1813, 1814, 1851, 1852
Schoechet, Nathan L.....	1837, 1838, 1840, 1842
Schonfield, Sylvia.....	1601, 1616, 1668-1675 (testimony), 1673
Schorr, Ruth.....	1802, 1804
Schribner, David.....	1713
Shafran, Eva.....	1786
Sbauchig, Mike.....	1744
Shapiro, Nathan.....	1826, 1856
Sherman, Al.....	1818
Sherman, Miriam Brook (Mrs. Al Sherman).....	1818
Shermis, Celia.....	1517
Sik, Sin Tu.....	1556
Silver, Max.....	1485, 1575, 1709, 1710, 1769, 1785, 1812, 1813, 1816, 1835
Siminov, Trudy.....	1817
Simmons, Herbert.....	1656
Smith, Delphine.....	1817
Smith, Edith.....	1784, 1787, 1788, 1796, 1798, 1799, 1805, 1815
Smith, Juanita.....	1783
Smith, Ruth.....	1805
Sniffen, Jane.....	1818
Sparks, Alice Ward (Mrs. Nemmy Sparks).....	1795, 1814, 1820, 1856
Sparks, Nemmy.....	1816, 1853, 1856
Spector, Frank.....	1517, 1817
Spencer, Vaino (Mrs.).....	1764
Stack, Loretta.....	1818
Stack, Walter.....	1461
Stapp, Frances.....	1817
Stapp, John.....	1815
Starcovik, Dave.....	1519
Stark, Louis.....	1787, 1788, 1796, 1799, 1800, 1882-1889 (testimony)
Stark, Marion (Mrs. Lou Stark).....	1788, 1798, 1799
Staughton, Gertrude.....	1826
Steinberg, Beatrice.....	1517
Steinberg, Henry.....	1822
Steinmetz, Harry.....	1501
Stevens, Arthur.....	1500, 1501, 1503
Stevenson, June.....	1461
Stout, Ann.....	1461
Strange, Arthur.....	1744

	Page
Straus, Leon	1609
Strong, Anna Louise	1581
Strout, Nathan	1802
Sugar Carl (also known as C. C. Carl)	1697-1704 (testimony)
Sullivan, Pauline	1788, 1802
Sun, Kwak Chong	1556
Sunoo, Harold W.	1551, 1552, 1558
Swanhauser, Jane	1822
Talley, James	1822
Talon, Tony	1806
Tanzman, Jules	1803
Taylor, Byron	1804
Taylor, Eleanor	1798, 1799
Taylor, Ellen (also known as Mary Rankin)	1796
Tenoyucca, Anna	1819
Tomren, I. M.	1802
Trojan, Ann	1815, 1856
Tse-tung, Mao	1501, 1505
Twine, E. C.	1826
Ulrich, Harry	1826
Uphaus, Willard	1609
Vandervoort, Pen	1805
Vandervoort, Susan (Mrs. Pen Vandervoort)	1805
Vaughn, Margaret. (<i>See</i> Meyer, Margaret Vaughn.)	
Vidaver, Matthew, Samuel, Jr.	1601, 1704, 1707-1713 (testimony)
Wallace, Floyd	1804
Wallace, Henry	1518
Wallace, Shevey (Mrs. Floyd Wallace)	1804, 1817, 1827
Wallace, William. (<i>See</i> Kimple, William Ward.)	
Walsh, Patrick	1728
Ward, Alice. (<i>See</i> Sparks, Alice Ward.)	
Ward, Sybil	1804
Ward, William. (<i>See</i> Kimple, William Ward.)	
Warford, Dave	1826
Warren, Virginia	1826
Watkins, Charles C.	1804
Weintraub, William	1826, 1855
Weber, S. A. (<i>See</i> Wereb, Stephen A.)	
Wellington, Chong	1554, 1557
Werb, Stephen A. (also known as S. A. Weber)	1779-1827
(testimony), 1838, 1840, 1846-1848, 1851-1859 (testimony), 1865, 1874, 1883.	
Westman, Arden (or Harden)	1827, 1856
Weyl, Nathaniel, Jr.	1510
Wheeldin, Martha Hard (formerly Martha Hard)	1827,
1859, 1875-1882 (testimony)	
White, Eliot	1609
Whitley, Frank	1815
Whitney, Anita	1766
Wilkerson, Angela. (<i>See</i> Clarke, Angela.)	
Wilkerson, Mel	1788
Wilkerson, Mrs. Mel	1804
Wilkerson, Robert	1826
Wilkinson, Jean	1601, 1614, 1615, 1676-1678 (testimony)
Wilson, Elizabeth	1575
Wirin, A. L.	1440, 1575, 1599, 1768
Wolf, William	1786
Won, Sonu Hak	1560, 1556
Yates, Oleta O'Connor	1461, 1854
Yong, Pak Hon	1552
Young, Adele	1815
Young, Charles. (<i>See</i> Gladstone, Charles.)	
Zamudio, Blanche	1804

ORGANIZATIONS

	Page
Abraham Lincoln Brigade.....	1799, 1813
American Committee for Protection of the Foreign Born: Los Angeles Committee.....	1834
American Federation of Radio Artists.....	1527
American League Against War and Fascism.....	1697
American Peace Crusade..... 1501, 1505, 1568, 1573, 1593, 1594, 1607, 1609	
Northern California.....	1501
Southern California..... 1501, 1504, 1505, 1513, 1516, 1568, 1570, 1573, 1574, 1578, 1579, 1591-1593, 1596, 1597, 1617, 1618, 1620, 1832-1834	
Executive Board.....	1502, 1516
San Diego Peace Forum..... 1500, 1501, 1503, 1505, 1514, 1516	
Executive Board.....	1502
American-Russian Institute (Los Angeles).....	1505-1507
American Veterans Committee.....	1811, 1812
American Women for Peace.....	1609
Asian and Pacific Peace Conference. (See Peace Conference of the Asian and Pacific Regions.)	
California Institute of Technology.....	1465-1468, 1470-1472
California Labor School (San Francisco).....	1510, 1873
Civil Rights Congress.....	1500
Communist Party:	
California.....	1451, 1518
Hollywood: Unit J-5.....	1841
Los Angeles City.....	1458
Adams group.....	1815
57th Assembly Branch.....	1841, 1842
Hawthorne Club.....	1798, 1864
Rhett Club.....	1815
South Side Section.....	1819, 1820
Unit A-3.....	1894
Watts Club.....	1857
West Lake Club.....	1782
Los Angeles County.....	1817, 1857
San Diego.....	1510, 1516-1520
San Francisco: North Beach No. 1 Club.....	1463
Communist Political Association.....	1461, 1462
<i>Daily People's World</i>	1461
Democratic Peoples Front League.....	1556
<i>Digest of Soviet News</i>	1507
Electrical Radio and Machine Workers of America, United.....	1714
Friends of Ormsby Village.....	1616, 1673, 1674, 1678
Friends of the Soviet Union.....	1449, 1550
German-American Bund.....	1697
Hollywood Writers Mobilization.....	1693
Independent Progressive Party..... 1500, 1503, 1518, 1800, 1801, 1834, 1884	
California.....	1611, 1663, 1693, 1694
San Diego County Central Committee.....	1518
State Central Committee.....	1835
West Adams Club.....	1610
International Bookstore (San Francisco).....	1462
International Labor Defense.....	1751
International Scientific Commission for the Investigation of the Facts Concerning Bacterial Warfare in Korea and China.....	1623
International Workers Order (Los Angeles).....	1460
Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee.....	1817
<i>Korean Independence</i> 1516, 1549, 1552, 1553, 1556, 1557, 1559, 1566, 1567	
Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, International.....	1729
Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers Union, United.....	1803
National Council of American-Soviet Friendship..... 1503-1506, 1511	
Ormsby Hill Trust, The.....	1619
Ormsby Village for Youth Foundation.....	1612,
1613, 1615, 1619, 1660, 1661, 1665, 1674, 1677, 1678, 1682	
Peace Conference of the Asian and Pacific Regions.....	1584, 1585, 1611, 1619

	Page
Peiping Peace Conference. (<i>See</i> Peace Conference of the Asian and Pacific Regions.)	
Peking Peace Conference. (<i>See</i> Peace Conference of the Asian and Pacific Regions.)	
People's Educational Center, The-----	1786
Progressive Bookshop, The (Los Angeles)-----	1815, 1855, 1857
Progressive Party-----	1556
Russian Information Service-----	1854
Screen Actors Guild-----	1527
Screen Cartoonists Guild-----	1541
Screen Office Employees Guild-----	1692, 1693
Seamen's Union, Canada-----	1729
Southern California Peace Crusade. (<i>See</i> American Peace Crusade.)	
Stockholm Peace Appeal-----	1596, 1597
Stockholm Peace Conference-----	1511
Thirtieth District Young Democrats-----	1519
Unemployed Councils-----	1734
United States, Government of: Office of Strategic Services-----	1476, 1477, 1492, 1493, 1547
Workers Alliance-----	1734
Workers Ex-Servicemen's League (Los Angeles)-----	1734, 1735
Young Communist League-----	1736, 1742, 1749, 1791
Young Pioneers-----	1736, 1742



BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 05706 3222

1.11

322 = NY pgs 5-8

3223 = Ohio

inf

2221 = NY pgs 1-4

g

2221 = SD

h

2226 = Rosenberg pgs 1-2

